

No 9335. 1^a 203

PS 1-8



GIVEN BY

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
NEW YORK CITY AREA—Part 3

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
Congress HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

MAY 6, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

CLYDE DOYLE, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

May 5, 1953 :	
Testimony of—	Page
Lionel Stander-----	1343
Jay Gorney-----	1370
Robert Gladnick-----	1377
Irving Charles Velson-----	1417
Index -----	1423

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121 STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 3

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
New York, N. Y.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:10 a. m., in room 1105 of the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Bernard W. Kearney, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle (appearance noted in transcript), and James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance noted in transcript).

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; Leslie C. Scott, research analyst; W. Jackson Jones, Earl L. Fuoss, and George C. Williams, investigators; Dolores Anderson and Thelma Searce, staff representatives; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Reporter, let the record show that present are Mr. Kearney, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Moulder, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum of the full committee.

Are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Is Mr. Lionel Stander in the hearing room?

Mr. STANDER. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Come forward, please.

Mr. VELDE. Raise your right hand and be sworn.

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. STANDER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LIONEL STANDER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, LEONARD B. BOUDIN

Mr. VELDE. Be seated.

Mr. STANDER. Before you ask me any questions, Mr. Velde, I would like it very much if you turned off the lights and discontinued the television cameras, as I am a professional performer and I only appear on TV for entertainment or for philanthropic organizations,

and I consider this a very serious matter that doesn't fall into either category——

Mr. VELDE. Well, now——

Mr. STANDER. And it is certainly not right that a witness should have to have the lights and the television cameras on him.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, do you feel the lights will affect your testimony?

Mr. STANDER. Yes; I do, and I feel the cameras being on would affect my testimony. Furthermore, if this were a live television show in which my entire testimony would be seen by the American people just the way I make it, I don't think I would have as strenuous objections; but I still might object.

Mr. VELDE. You mean a man who has been before the cameras and before the lights such as you have would have difficulty in testifying?

Mr. STANDER. Yes; I do, because when I am before a camera I am before the camera as an actor and an entertainer, not as a witness.

Mr. VELDE. You are before the United States Government now, a committee of the Congress of the United States Government.

Mr. STANDER. Which is a very serious thing, sir.

Mr. VELDE. It is a very serious thing.

Mr. STANDER. And I am not here just as an actor or an entertainer.

Mr. VELDE. Let me tell you, Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. If I were here as an actor and entertainer, I wouldn't have any objection whatsoever, but——

Mr. VELDE. Let me tell you, Mr. Stander, the Committee on Un-American Activities desires to give the public the information that comes before it in all shapes and forms, and the excuse that you have that you are a professional entertainer——

Mr. STANDER. That isn't an excuse; it is a fact.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Has no bearing whatsoever.

Mr. STANDER. I resent the fact that you say it is an excuse. I am a professional entertainer and it is quite different, as any actor will tell you, to come before the camera in a carefully rehearsed script and, on the other hand, to come before the camera as a witness before a congressional committee, which is a very serious thing, which isn't entertainment and which certainly isn't a benefit for a charitable institution.

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. And that is my position, and I feel very strongly about this, and I would appreciate it very much if you would turn the lights off and turn the cameras off.

Mr. BOUDIN. It's been done for other witnesses.

Mr. STANDER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it would be prejudicial for you not to turn off the cameras and the lights for me because, as I understand, from reading in the press, it has been done for other witnesses.

Mr. VELDE. Certainly it has been done for other witnesses, but for other reasons, Mr. Stander, and the reasons were it would make them nervous and/or in some way interfere with the testimony they had to give.

Mr. STANDER. I am not exactly calm this morning. I haven't had any sleep. As you know, I am playing in another city, and I haven't had any sleep at all tonight. I've traveled here, and I don't want to bore you with the details of my personal complications, but I was

unable to get a room in a hotel and I stayed up; and I would be highly nervous——

Mr. VELDE. Could you——

Mr. STANDER. Particularly as an actor likes——

Mr. VELDE. Can you say——

Mr. STANDER. To give a good performance, and I can't give a good performance now that I haven't rehearsed, and inasmuch as I haven't had an opportunity to go over this matter and had time to consult with counsel——

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Stander, let me ask you——

Mr. STANDER. I have been in Washington, and I have been in Philadelphia, and I was unable to secure counsel until I was in Washington——

Mr. VELDE. Yes; but we expect you to testify to the truth, and that is just the question. I was going to ask you: If we do turn off the cameras, will you answer the questions that are put to you by counsel?

Mr. STANDER. I absolutely intend to cooperate with this committee and answer any questions to the best of my ability. I took an oath, and I believe in my oaths.

Mr. VELDE. In that particular case, will the television and newsreel cameras please desist at the present time, and will the still photographers take their pictures and kindly retire during the witness' testimony?

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. STANDER. Lionel Stander.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. STANDER. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. BOUDIN. Leonard B. Boudin, 76 Beaver Street, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think I should make a statement to the committee of the purposes for the calling of this witness at this time.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness previously appeared before this committee in 1940, and at that time denied having been a member of the Communist Party and stated that he never intended to be.

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered the hearing room at this point.)

In 1951 information came to the committee which resulted in the issuance of a subpoena on March 29, 1951, for his appearance before the committee on April 20. Because of certain circumstances that was continued until April 24.

The committee received a request from the then counsel for the witness that, because of an engagement that he had at the hospital, he would like a continuance, and that continuance was granted.

However, on the 24th a witness by the name of Marc Lawrence testified before the committee and in the course of his testimony alluded to this witness by name.

On the following day a telegram was received from the witness in which he denied the statements made by Mr. Lawrence with reference to him and requested that the committee give him an immediate opportunity to appear before the committee in regard to it.

Then there was considerable correspondence backward and forward between the witness and the committee, endeavoring to find the date at which he could appear.

My files——

Mr. STANDER. Pardon me. Might I interrupt just for 1 second in the interest of clarifying that?

Mr. TAVENNER. My files——

Mr. VELDE. You may make a statement after counsel finishes.

Mr. STANDER. Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this correspondence the witness requested that he be given an opportunity to appear immediately. That was particularly in his letter of May 10.

Mr. CLARDY. May 10 of what year?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1951.

My last letter or the committee's last letter to the witness with regard to that was on June 30 of 1951, in which it was stated, in substance, that an effort would be made to work it out with the chairman and a date fixed.

Now, my files contain a reference under date of July 5, which was just a few days after the last letter to the witness, indicating that on July 19 further investigative matters would be heard by the committee with regard to this witness; and then, for a considerable period after that, the investigation continued with the results which will be made apparent during the course of the hearing.

Mr. VELDE. So that——

Mr. TAVENNER. Now——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). This matter has been before the committee for approximately 3 years, then; is that correct?

Mr. TAVENNER. Since this immediate matter—since April or May 1951.

Mr. VELDE. For 2 years?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

It was not our purpose in calling the witness now to go into any matter which was involved in the hearing in his appearance before the committee in 1940. It is only as the result of investigative information and testimony received by the committee during the investigation which began in 1951 that we have called this witness.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, you had a correction or——

Mr. STANDER. Yes; I would——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Or something to say in clarification.

Mr. STANDER. The delay asked for by my then attorney was for 1 day.

I have voluminous correspondence here which shows I tried to get an immediate hearing. I sent a letter to each and every member of the committee. I have one here, for example, dated May 14, 1951, from Congressman Kearney, who says:

DEAR SIR: In this morning's mail I received a copy of a letter you sent to the Committee on Un-American Activities and Hon. John S. Wood.

I am taking this matter up with the chairman and asking that he call you at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let me——

Mr. STANDER. Having received that letter——

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). Interrupt you there and——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). I went in person to Washington and saw Congressman Kearney, who assured me——

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). That I would have an immediate hearing because it was very important to me, because merely receiving the subpoena with the press's announcement that I was subpoenaed caused me to be blacklisted in radio, television, and motion pictures. So, I had an immediate economic motive for an immediate appearance.

Congressman Kearney told me he had contacted the counsel and chairman of the committee and I would be heard within a day or two.

I went back to New York and I received the telegram from Mr. Tavenner, or Mr. Wood, which said he assured me I would be heard immediately.

At the same time I sued the witness, who perjured himself before this committee, Mr. Marc Lawrence, in the State Supreme Court of New York, who ruled that he enjoyed congressional immunity. However, if he——

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander, we are not interested in those extraneous matters.

Mr. STANDER. I don't think they are extraneous, when a man comes directly from the psychopathic ward under the care of two psychiatrists, Dr. Hannel and Dr. Orloff, and I wrote this letter and informed every one of the committeemen that this man, a psychopathic, was used as a witness against me and, under advice of counsel, fled to Europe and is still a refugee from this court case.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Counsel, do I understand there was considerable correspondence and some difficulty in hitting upon a mutually satisfactory date.

Mr. STANDER. The difficulty——

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me, Mr. Stander.

Mr. STANDER. I wanted an immediate hearing, and it is 2 years since I requested it——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. And for 2 years I have been blacklisted——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. Because of the newspaper stories.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander, may I suggest I wasn't talking to you.

Mr. STANDER. Sorry.

Mr. CLARDY. Later I will ask you some questions.

Mr. STANDER. Thank you. I will be delighted to converse with you later.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, to get back to the matter, Counsel: I understand there was some correspondence and difficulty to hit upon a mutually satisfactory date. Is that what you are trying to tell us?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is in substance it.

One of the letters, I recall, states what hearings were being conducted and a hearing date could not be fixed until the completion——

Mr. STANDER. Pardon me, sir. I never objected to any date. The lawyer asked a delay of 1 day.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. I wanted an immediate date.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Stander. You will be given an opportunity to talk.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is the last letter which I referred to—June 30—acknowledging receipt of the witness' letter of June 28:

The committee has been in continuous session since June 18.

Mr. STANDER. What year was that, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. June 30, 1951.

The committee members will not be here during the week of July 2.

Numerous witnesses have been subpoenaed for every day during the week of July 9 and well into the week of July 16.

I recognize the justice of your desire and will do what I can to have an early date fixed, even if it interferes with the completion of the testimony on the subject of the present hearings.

I will take the matter up with the chairman upon his return on July 9—

The chairman was then on the west coast.

and will advise you within a few days thereafter as to what dates are available.

Then I stated that within a few days after that further investigation had reflected certain things which required more investigation.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I asked that because, as you know, I only came on the committee since the first of the year and I wanted to get a little—

Mr. STANDER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Of the background. However, since the first of the year, has the investigation continued pretty well down until right about now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the investigation has continued during our entire course of work in California.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Does his correspondence indicate, Mr. Counsel, at all times he wanted an early hearing?

That seems to be—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; he—

Mr. MOULDER (continuing). The point before the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. He did—

Mr. STANDER. I think I can clarify this by reading a letter received from Congressman Kearney.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Mr. VELDE. Just a moment until counsel finishes.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is true. He did ask for a hearing up until the early part of July.

Mr. VELDE. What year?

Mr. STANDER. What year?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1951.

Mr. STANDER. That is 2 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since our hearings in California, during which certain witnesses have testified in regard to him, there has been no request for a hearing.

Mr. CLARDY. I was going to ask you: Has there been any request since I came on the committee?

There has been no request since Mr. Ashe¹ testified in California.

Mr. STANDER. May I read this letter into the record, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sorry. There was a request made at a later date, which was in September—

¹ Harold J. Ashe.

Mr. CLARDY. September.

Mr. TAVENNER. September 17, 1951.

Mr. CLARDY. September 17.

Mr. STANDER. Let me read this letter from Congressman Kearney, which is dated June 21, 1951, almost 2 years ago. It is addressed to me at my home. It says:

DEAR SIR: I am leaving the city for a week and upon my return expect to have the hearings resume.

I shall bring your plea to the chairman and, frankly, I am of the opinion that you should be heard without delay.

That was 2 years ago.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, there isn't any denial on that part, is there——

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Stander——

Pardon me.

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). As far as I am personally concerned?

Mr. STANDER. I appreciated your courtesy, Congressman Kearney. The only point in my reading this letter is to show that I had demanded an immediate appearance to refute this perjurer. I went to court to try to prove in a court of law he was a perjurer and, under advice of counsel, he fled from the country so he wouldn't be able to make a statement to the press——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. And would be able, therefore, to make use of legal immunity——

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. And not face up to the responsibility——

Mr. VELDE. That is entirely uncalled for, Mr. Stander. I can see no reason to further argue about this question. You are here at the present time. Let's have your testimony, and we will appreciate——

Mr. STANDER. But I think it is very important——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Your not going into——

Mr. STANDER. Very pertinent to the matter——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). These extraneous matters.

Mr. STANDER. And I think it is very desirous to the American people to know about everything that was happening here——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, will you——

Mr. STANDER. That I asked for an appearance 2 years ago, and 2 years later I'm called, and——

Mr. CLARDY. Do I understand, Mr. Stander, you are here to answer the \$64 question when we ask it?

Mr. STANDER. I will answer every question truthfully, to the best of my ability, and I am perfectly aware of the fact I have made an oath, and I am not in the habit of violating my oath or my word, even when I don't swear under oath.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Stander, will you tell the committee, please, when and where were you born?

Mr. STANDER. New York City, January 11, 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Mr. STANDER. Well, I'm basically an actor. I have been a newspaper reporter. I have been a director of various stage entertainments for the Red Cross, the Air Force, the Kiwanis, junior and senior chambers of commerce, Elks, Moose, and other organizations with animal names. I've been an entertainer, director. I've produced two Broadway plays.

I've been a theatrical person for the last 26 years, with an occasional venture into the field of journalism.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you also done screenwriting or acting?

Mr. STANDER. I have done screen acting. I have written a script or two for the screen.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you engaged as a screen actor, and where?

Mr. STANDER. Well, my very first jobs were in the old silent days as a kid actor, and then I went out—I made pictures here for Warner Bros. out in Brooklyn at the Divido Studios years ago. I worked with Marian Davies at the old Hearst Cosmopolitan, and went out under a Hollywood contract in January 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in Hollywood as a screen actor?

Mr. STANDER. Until I was the first person who exposed the criminal records of Browne and Bioff, the IATSE racketeer-gangster officials who later went to jail, and, because I exposed them 1 week before Mr. Pegler exposed them in the paper, I was blacklisted by the Motion Picture Producers' Association—the major studios. So, in other words, that was from the time, 1935, until the meeting in which I exposed these two racketeering gangsters who the Federal Government later put in the can.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question to you was: How long did you continue to—

Mr. STANDER. Well—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Work as an actor?

Mr. STANDER. I don't remember the exact date, but I have worked as an actor continually since then. After the major studios blacklisted me, I worked for independent producers—

Mr. TAVENNER. Approximately—

Mr. STANDER. Up until the time Mr. Marc Lawrence mentioned my name, or rather, up until the time Larry Parks said he didn't know me as a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me—

Mr. STANDER. And that appeared in the paper, and just to have my name appear in association with this committee—it seems like something; it shouldn't; I agree—I know it isn't the committee's fault. It is like the Spanish Inquisition.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me remind you—

Mr. STANDER. You may not be burned, but you can't help coming away a little singed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me remind you of my question: How long did you continue to engage in the profession of screen acting—

Mr. STANDER. Screen acting.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). In California?

Mr. STANDER. In California, up until—outside of a period in which I enlisted in the Royal Canadian Air Force, United States Air Force, about 2½ years, 3 years, it was from 1935 until 1948, or 1949. I'm not sure of the exact date. Then I made a few pictures, independent, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. And during that period of time you served in the Armed Forces, either of this or some other country, did I understand?

Mr. STANDER. Well, not some other country. I enlisted in the RCAF, but I was in a show and had to give notice, and in the mean-

time, in between, the United States went to war and President Roosevelt issued an edict that nobody between the ages of 18 and 45 with any sort of pilot training cross the border. So I was unable to fulfill my enlistment in the Royal Canadian Air Force, and I enlisted subsequently, a few months later, for pilot training in the United States Air Force.

Every one of the committee received my war record, and I don't like to talk about it, because it is there and I do not like to match my patriotism with anybody.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am just trying to ascertain dates. What is the approximate date you went into the Armed Forces——

Mr. STANDER. I think I have my Army discharge here——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). And the date you——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). And I'll refer to it.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Were discharged?

Mr. STANDER. Well, this is the first Army discharge. You are not interested in that. The first time I enlisted was in peacetime. The second time I enlisted in——

Mr. VELDE. Well, I think we are interested in both.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking for the dates when he——

Mr. STANDER. Are you interested in both, sir?

Well, the first time I enlisted in the Armed Forces was in——

Mr. TAVENNER. Will the witness answer my question, please?

Mr. STANDER. 1922. The last time in 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were in the service——

Mr. STANDER. I enlisted in the Royal Canadian Air Force in 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. From 1942 until what date were you in the armed services?

Mr. STANDER. May 5, 1944.

And, incidentally, while I'm looking at it here, I notice that the Chief of Staff, who was then Colonel Morgan, signed my character as excellent and then Glenn O. Bacus, who I worked directly under—he was then commanding general of the headquarters' staff—he later got some very good publicity in the papers because of his heroic exploits. He is the man who made 13 strikes with saber jets. I worked directly under him. Glenn Bacus and Colonel Morgan, and every other officer of the headquarters staff, upon my discharge, gave me letters and autographed pictures attesting to my excellent service record and character. In fact, the Chief of Staff initialed it himself.

That is in answer to the chairman about my war record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it correct to say——

Mr. STANDER. Also, in regard to that, I see a citation from the Red Cross, the war bond drive, the Treasury Department, and here is a tribute to me from the Armed Forces Radio Service, November 12, 1947:

DEAR MR. STANDER: May I extend my appreciation for your splendid cooperation.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER (continuing to read).

Cooperation such as yours makes it possible here for the staff to carry on the work which means so much to our troops overseas——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, let me——

Mr. STANDER (continuing to read).

and the many combat casualties here at home.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, will you—

Mr. STANDER. I have a number of these.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Answer the question of counsel as simply as possible?

Mr. STANDER. I want to say—

Mr. VELDE. You may elaborate later if there is some part of your career you are proud of.

Mr. STANDER. I am proud of everything I said publicly or privately, and—

Mr. VELDE. You have made some self-serving statements, and the committee—

Mr. STANDER. I am not charged with anything, am I?

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander—

Mr. STANDER. Does this committee charge me with being a Communist?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, will you let me tell you whether you are charged with being a Communist?

Will you be quiet just for a minute while I will tell you what you are here for?

Mr. STANDER. Yes; I would like to hear.

Mr. VELDE. You are here to give us information, facts and information, which will enable us to do the work that was assigned to us by the House of Representatives, which is a duty imposed upon us to investigate reports regarding subversive activities in the United States.

Mr. STANDER. Well, I am more than willing to cooperate—

Mr. VELDE. Now, just a minute.

Mr. STANDER. Because I have—I know of some subversive activities in the entertainment industry and, elsewhere in the country.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, the committee is interested—

Mr. STANDER. If you are interested, I can tell you some right now.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Primarily in any subversive knowledge you have—

Mr. STANDER. And I have knowledge of some subversive action.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). In the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. STANDER. I don't know about the overthrow of the Government. This committee has been investigating 15 years so far, and hasn't even found one act of violence.

Mr. VELDE. Now, the record will speak for itself.

Mr. STANDER. Well, I have been reading the record.

Mr. VELDE. That is entirely—

Mr. STANDER. I know of some subversion, and I can help the committee if it is really interested.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander—

Mr. STANDER. I know of a group of fanatics who are desperately trying to undermine the Constitution of the United States by depriving artists and others of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness without due process of law.

If you are interested in that, I would like to tell you about it. I can tell names, and I can cite instances, and I am one of the first victims of it; and if you are interested in that—and also a group of ex-Bundists, American Firsters, and anti-Semites, people who hate everybody, including Negroes, minority groups, and most likely themselves—

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander, let me——

Mr. STANDER. And these people are engaged in the conspiracy, outside all the legal processes, to undermine our very fundamental American concepts upon which our entire system of jurisprudence exists——

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. And who also——

Mr. VELDE. Let me tell you this: You are a witness before this committee——

Mr. STANDER. Well, if you are interested——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). A committee of the Congress of the United States——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). I am willing to tell you——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And you are in the same position as any other witness before this committee——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). I am willing to tell you about these activities——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Regardless of your standing in the motion-picture world——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). Which I think are subversive.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Or for any other reason.

No witness can come before this committee and insult the committee——

Mr. STANDER. Is this an insult to the committee——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And continue to——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). When I inform the committee I know of subversive activities which are contrary to the Constitution?

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander, unless you begin to answer these questions and act like a witness in a reasonable, dignified manner, under the rules of the committee, I will be forced to have you removed from this room.

Mr. STANDER. Well, I——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander, may I say——

Mr. STANDER. I am deeply shocked, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander, let me——

Mr. STANDER. Let me explain myself. I don't mean to be contemptuous of this committee at all.

Mr. VELDE. Will you——

Mr. STANDER. I want to cooperate with it.

You said something—you said you would like me to cooperate with you in your attempt to unearth subversive activities. I know of such subversive activities. I began to tell you about them, and I am shocked by your cutting me off. You don't seem to be interested in the sort of subversive activities I know about.

Mr. VELDE. You will be asked questions relative to subversive activities by counsel.

Mr. STANDER. All right.

Mr. VELDE. Just let him ask you.

Mr. STANDER. All right. Let him ask me, and I will be glad to answer.

And I am not a dupe, or a dope, or a moe, or a schmoe, and everything I did—I was absolutely conscious of what I was doing, and I am not ashamed of everything I said in public or private; and I am

very proud of my war record, my private record as a citizen and my public record as an entertainer.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Stander, we have heard a lot about that. Now, won't you be courteous enough to let our general counsel ask you the questions, and you cooperate and answer them——

Mr. STANDER. I'm sorry——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And not take——

Mr. STANDER. But there was an inference of the chairman that deeply irritated me——

Mr. DOYLE. Well——

Mr. STANDER. And that is I was out of order. I thought——

Mr. DOYLE. You have made your record.

Mr. STANDER. I have tried——

Mr. DOYLE. You have made your record, and it is very glorious and very fine.

Mr. STANDER. I am glad the committee——

Mr. DOYLE. Now, won't you go ahead and cooperate——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). Thinks that is a very fine record.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And let somebody else do some talking?

Mr. STANDER. I would like that put in the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Stander, is it correct to say, then, you were engaged as an actor in Hollywood between 1935 and 1948, with the exception of the period when you were in the Armed Services from 1942 to 1944?

Mr. STANDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were some of the major screen credits as an actor?

Mr. STANDER. I made about a hundred screen plays, and luckily I have forgotten most of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I am not asking you for all of them.

Mr. STANDER. Well, the major ones——

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you just give us a few of the major ones?

Mr. STANDER. Well, Deeds Goes to Town, Specter of the Rose, A Star is Born, The Milky Way, The Kid from Brooklyn—a number of other titles that are completely unimportant to me——

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, after——

Mr. STANDER. Over a hundred screen plays.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall whether you left Hollywood in 1948 or in 1949?

Mr. STANDER. I—it might have been 1948 or 1949. I'm not sure. I went to make a personal appearance tour of the night-club circuit, which was the only thing left to me after being blacklisted by the major studios——

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell——

Mr. STANDER. By merely newspaper accusation, without anybody charging me with anything.

In fact, the last time I appeared here the chairman very specifically said that this committee didn't charge me with anything, and I swore under oath—I would like, if you want, to introduce the record of my testimony here in August 27, 1940.¹

Mr. VELDE. Well, you are not——

Mr. TAVENNER. I stated in the beginning——

¹ Lionel Stander testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in executive session, on August 27, 1940.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Charged with anything.

Mr. STANDER. I am not charged——

Mr. VELDE. You do understand, as I stated before, you are not charged with anything this time.

Mr. STANDER. I am not charged with anything?

Mr. VELDE. You are not charged with anything, Mr. Stander. You are here——

Mr. STANDER. I would like the record to show I am not charged with being a member of the Communist Party; I am not charged with lying under oath, because I have made continuous oaths to various governmental agencies.

You are not charging me with being a Communist; right?

Mr. VELDE. We are——

Mr. STANDER. I want——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander, will you subside?

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Asking you questions relative to subversive——

Mr. STANDER. I just want that clear.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. In other words, you are not charging me with being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. VELDE. You are being asked questions, Mr. Stander, relative to——

Mr. STANDER. But I don't——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. Understand them.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you subside until the chairman finishes?

Mr. VELDE. You are brought here as a witness.

Mr. STANDER. I am a witness——

Mr. VELDE. Please don't——

Mr. STANDER. Not a defendant.

I haven't been accused of anything. I want that very straight, because through newspaper headlines people get peculiar attitudes. Mere appearance here is tantamount—not just appearance; the mere fact, in my case, I was subpoenaed, is tantamount—to being blacklisted because people say, "What is an actor doing in front of the Un-American Activities Committee?"

Mr. CLARDY. Why did you want to appear before the committee so badly, then, if that is the case?

Mr. STANDER. Because I was told by my agent if I appeared before the committee and the committee was a fair committee and allowed me to refute Lawrence's testimony that I would be able to get back in television and motion pictures.

I had made 11 television shows in a row, and one of the biggest TV agencies and producers had told my agent that if I went—could get before the committee and could again swear under oath that I wasn't, I would have my own TV program, which meant over \$150,000 a year to me.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. So, I had a hundred-and-fifty-thousand-buck motive——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander, will you subside?

Mr. STANDER. For coming before the committee.

Mr. CLARDY. May I suggest something to you?

If you have a genuine and earnest desire to clear up something which should be cleared up, if you will just cooperate——

Now, don't say a word until I give you the opportunity. If you will just subside and answer the questions, fairly and directly, and truthfully, I am sure you will accomplish your purpose.

MR. STANDER. Are you inferring——

MR. CLARDY. Now, just a minute, Mr. Stander.

MR. STANDER (continuing). Anything I said wasn't the truth?

MR. CLARDY. Mr. Stander, may I tell you something? Unless you do that, whether you realize it or not, your performance is not going to be regarded as funny, because this is serious business—if you will subside and answer the questions as they are put to you, frankly, honestly, and without attempting to be smart or funny, you will have accomplished your purpose; otherwise, you are going to defeat it.

MR. STANDER. I want to state right now I was not——

MR. CLARDY. Will you please subside?

MR. STANDER (continuing). Trying to be smart——

MR. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

MR. STANDER (continuing). Or funny.

MR. CLARDY. Please be quiet, Mr. Stander, until I finish.

MR. STANDER. Then can I make a statement?

MR. CLARDY. Won't you be a gentleman and listen to the questions and answer them?

Unless you do, the very thing you want to refute is going to be left in the minds of the public indelibly. You are going to be stamped as something you may want to say you are not.

Now, if you will just go along with this committee, you will have no trouble at all; but if you don't, if you continue with what you are doing, or going to or have been doing, I am going to suggest to the chairman that you are putting on a show, that you are doing it for no other purpose than to make a show, and I am going to ask him to turn on the lights and cameras so that your performance may be recorded for posterity.

Now, if you will subside and go along, I am not going to make that request.

MR. STANDER. Mr. Chairman, may I state that, first, to clear up this misunderstanding, I have never been more deadly serious in my life.

MR. CLARDY. All right, then——

MR. STANDER. If anything I said——

MR. CLARDY. That is the question.

MR. STANDER (continuing). Seemed humorous or funny, I assure you it was purely coincidental and doesn't mirror what I deeply feel, because my entire career and the respect of my fellow artists and the American people is at stake, and I don't think that is very funny and I don't mean to be funny.

MR. CLARDY. And I do not think so either.

I am a new member of this committee, and I want to give you all possible opportunity to say what you have to say, but I want you to do it in the proper way.

MR. STANDER. Thank you, sir.

MR. CLARDY. Now, Mr. Counsel——

MR. STANDER. Sir, I hope you understand my feeling. I am not trying to be funny or put on a show. If I did, I would have the lights on.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you have been, sir, and may I tell you that, and it is not funny to me because this is intensely serious to me.

Now, if you will go along with my suggestions, you will have no trouble.

Mr. STANDER. It is just as serious to me. My whole career is at stake.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Stander, will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has consisted of?

Mr. STANDER. Well, I went to public schools in New York City, Mount Vernon. I went to various prep schools; a few colleges. I didn't complete my college education. The last university I went to was the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you attend the University of North Carolina?

Mr. STANDER. I think it it was 1927 or 1928. I think it was the class of 1930. I don't remember. I don't even remember. It was so long ago I can't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Stander, I want to present to you some of the results of the investigation that the committee has made in California relating to activities of the Communist Party and which, if true, would indicate that you have a special knowledge of things that the committee is inquiring about; and, as a basis for further questioning, I want to read you certain portions of the testimony, which you may consider until I have completed the reading of it, and then propound a question to you.

Mr. Marc Lawrence, as mentioned before, was a witness before this committee on April 24, the day you were expected to be, in 1951. In the course of his testimony he admitted having been a member of the Communist Party for a comparatively short period of time, and he was asked to describe the circumstances under which he became a party member. This is part of his testimony:

About 1938 I attended a number of cause parties [c-a-u-s-e—cause parties]. This was not because I was interested at the time, but that is what happened.

There was a girl who played the piano very well, and she introduced me to these parties. I went to these parties with her, and then I met an actor named Lionel Stander, who said to me, "You want to get to know how to talk to these people. The thing for you to do is to go to classes."

Then he testified he attended 12 meetings of the Communist Party as a member of a Communist Party cell, and being asked the specific question as to where these meetings were held, Mr. Lawrence in his reply stated:

They were held in different homes in Hollywood. Some I remember; some I don't.

I remember a guy named Lester Cole. Lester Cole was there and the guy who introduced me to the party, Lionel Stander—he was there.

Now, at our hearings which began in Hollywood on September 17, 1951, Mr. Harold J. Ashe, who was a member——

Mr. BOUDIN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there some question?

Mr. BOUDIN. May I just see it?

Mr. VELDE. That is a public record you are reading from?

Mr. BOUDIN. Yeah; that is.

Go right ahead.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harold J. Ashe, who was at one time a member of the State committee of the Communist Party, and who was a Com-

munist Party organizer in Los Angeles County, testified before the committee and told of his own connections with the Communist Party as a functionary, and he advised the committee that it was at his instance that professional cells of the Communist Party were first established in Hollywood.

He described the reasons for that—namely, the principal reason being that members of the professions would not be likely to become Communist Party members unless they had some special protection, some special secrecy; and, for that reason, these professional cells in the Communist Party were first established, in which the rank-and-file members of the Communist Party were just as unaware as outsiders of the membership of those cells.

He testified that the first of those cells was given the name Z-100; and then they broke it down into two cells. The second one was called Z-150.

Later those cells were further subdivided, and we find the lawyers all in one cell; we find the doctors all in one cell, and we find the screenwriters and various other persons in different cells of the profession cells of the party.

Now, Mr. Ashe was asked this question:

I wish you would give to the committee the names of the members of these professional units whose membership was to be kept secret.

Mr. Ashe then proceeded to give information relating to various persons who were members of it, and in the course of that this is his testimony:

Lucy Stander, who was the wife of J. Stander, also known as Lionel Stander——

Now, I do not propose——

Mr. STANDER. At what time was that?

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). To ask any question——

Mr. STANDER. What date was that?

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not propose to ask any question regarding your wife——

Mr. STANDER. I am not married.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or your former wife.

Mr. STANDER. Which one?

I am asking that seriously.

Which one?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the name mentioned here was Lucy.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you remember that name?

Mr. STANDER. Yeah; I remember her, vaguely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me read that again:

Lucy Stander, who was at that time the wife of J. Stander, also known as Lionel Stander.

Mr. STANDER. What time was that? What year?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think it was along about 1936.

I'll try to verify that exact date for you.

(At this point Mr. Stander conferred with Mr. Boudin.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Presently I will examine and find out.

Mr. SCHIERER. It was evidently the time he was married to Lucy, wasn't it?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would think so.

Mr. STANDER. The reason why I ask—because I wasn't married to Lucy in 1936.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, that is the reason I said—

Mr. STANDER. That is why I am asking about the date.

Mr. SCHERER. It was evidently the time you were married to Lucy. You would know when you were married to Lucy, wouldn't you?

Mr. STANDER. Yes. We separated in 1935—the early part of the year.

That's why I'm asking the question.

Mr. BOUDIN. Could we have the page?

Mr. STANDER. Could we have the page of that information?

My counsel—

Mr. TAVENNER. 1429.¹

I will attempt to read it again:

Lucy Stander, who was the wife of J. Stander, also known as Lionel Stander—he was a character actor, I believe, in Hollywood. He, however, was not in the unit for any great length of time. I recall distinctly that he was brought in and a very short time later was transferred out. I don't know the reason for the transfer. I think it was arranged directly between Stander and the county office of the party. However, his wife remained in one of these professional units.

Question: You are definite in your statement, however, that Lionel Stander was a member of this group?

Mr. ASHE. Lionel Stander was definitely a member of this group. He was transferred in and I handled the transfer. Of that I am positive.

Mr. CLARDY. Who is speaking when you are saying that?

Mr. TAVENNER. This is Mr. Ashe, a former functionary of the Communist Party. His name is Harold J. Ashe—A-s-h-e.

A further question was asked:

Do you recall from what place he was transferred?

Mr. Ashe said: I believe New York City.

Mr. STANDER. May I interrupt?

Mr. BOUDIN. In that time which refers to his wife's statement—1934—he wasn't in Hollywood in 1934.

Mr. STANDER. It is page 1468.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will just wait and let me make this statement, then you will have an opportunity to reply.

Mrs. Ashe—Mrs. Mildred Ashe—formerly the wife of—

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). formerly the wife—

Mr. STANDER. What is the question?

I am trying to get—

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Counsel—

Mr. STANDER. I am trying to get an answer to this. I am trying to find out what the question is.

Mr. KEARNEY. I want to say, frankly, I am getting a little bit confused here on the long dissertations of the testimony of these witnesses. I was wondering if you could break it down and ask the question so we will be familiar with what you are reading there.

Mr. MOULDER. Just question the witness on each count.

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

¹ Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion-Picture Industry, pt. 4, September 17, 1951.

Mr. MOULDER. I think that is a very good idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I proposed to do that, but I wanted, first, to show from these facts, if they were true, what his knowledge should be and then ask him about his knowledge and give him an opportunity to refute any parts of this testimony that he desires to refute.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean you want to paint the whole picture first—

Mr. TAVENNER. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. And then go back over it?

Mr. TAVENNER. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. How close to the end are you?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I am nearly at the end. I have one more witness besides the one I started with.

Mrs. Ashe testified that she had helped to organize this professional cell, Z-100, and was, herself, a member of it. She was asked a question:

Will you state to the committee the names of those who were members of the professional club whom you can now recall?

Mrs. Ashe replied:

Well, Lionel Stander, for a short time, was in the Z-100. His wife, Lucy, was recruited into Z-100.

And she then proceeds to name other persons.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you going to cross-examine him on each witness, Mr. TAVENNER?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Further, Mrs. Ashe testified that she had made collections for the Communist Party prior to her knowing he was a member of the Communist Party and before Mr. Stander had become a member of Z-100.

Then, there was another witness who appeared before the committee—

Mr. STANDER. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). By the name—

Mr. STANDER (continuing). I can't remember all of those.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will give you—

Mr. VELDE. Counsel will go back.

Mr. STANDER. I see.

Mr. VELDE. That is the idea.

Mr. CLARDY. That was the purpose of my question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. STANDER. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, there appeared the testimony of Mr. Martin Berkeley, who testified on September 19—

Mr. CLARDY. 1951?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1951, in which Mr. Martin Berkeley described a meeting at the home of Mr. Tuttle, a director—Mr. Frank Tuttle—at which persons other than Communist Party members were present and at which V. J. Jerome spoke.

(At this point Mr. Stander conferred with Mr. Boudin.)

Mr. CLARDY. V. J. Jerome being an important Communist Party functionary?

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a high functionary in the Communist Party, the head of the cultural section of the party at that time.

(At this point Mr. Stander conferred with Mr. Boudin.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And then Mr. Berkeley proceeded to tell the purposes of V. J. Jerome in his appearance in Hollywood in connection with the Communist Party, and then this question was asked Mr. Berkeley:

Well, as a result of his work, what occurred?

That is in relation to the work of V. J. Jerome.

Mr. Berkeley replied:

As a result of the work that was done by Jerome, groups of actors were enlisted in the current squabble that was going on at the guild, inside the Screen Actors' Guild.

Then this question:

Now, before we come to a discussion of that, can you give us the names of persons known to you at the time, persons who later were known to you, to be members of the Communist Party, who had attended this first meeting at the home of Frank Tuttle, which was being addressed by V. J. Jerome?

(At this point Mr. Stander conferred with Mr. Boudin.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And Mr. Berkeley, in naming the persons, had this to say:

I also met for the first time Lionel Stander, who later became chairman of the actors' fraction. With him was his wife—his then wife—Alice Twitchell.

It is interesting to know some time later during the strike at the Hollywood Citizens' News, for which I gave a benefit at my home for the striking newspapermen, at which we raised approximately a thousand dollars, I believe, to help the Newspaper Guild—and I am very proud that we did—Standar was at this meeting and called me over into a corner and introduced me to Comrade Harry Bridges.

Question: You refer to Stander as the chairman of the actors' fraction, if I understood you correctly. Then he describes what is meant by "fraction."

(At this point Mr. Stander conferred with Mr. Boudin.)

Mr. TAVENNER. He was then asked the question:

Did you ever attend a Communist Party meeting in the home of Lionel Stander?

(At this point Mr. Stander conferred with Mr. Boudin.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Berkeley replied:

I did, sir. There was a meeting called at the home of Stander, at which V. J. Jerome was present, that dealt with the matter of the struggle then going on in the Screen Actors' Guild.

And, then, one more matter: Mr. Martin Berkeley testified before the committee in executive session on January 29, 1952, at which time he stated, with reference to Mr. Belfrage, who was a witness here yesterday:

My first official party contact with Belfrage was at his home at a meeting attended by Herbert Biberman, Gale Sondergaard, Lionel Stander, and his wife, Alice.

(At this point Mr. Stander conferred with Mr. Boudin.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read):

Nobody was there except party members.

Mr. BOUDIN. Would you repeat the last thing—I'm sorry—about Belfrage?

Mr. TAVENNER. The entire statement?

Mr. BOUDIN. No; the Belfrage item.

Mr. STANDER. About Belfrage.

Mr. BOUDIN. I am very sorry. I missed that last.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

My first official contact with Belfrage was at his home at a meeting attended by Herbert Biberman, Gale Sondergaard, Lionel Stander, and his wife, Alice. Nobody was there except party members.

Mr. BOUDIN. Is there a date?

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not know the date.

Mr. STANDER. I think I can answer. I'll try to——

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, if you will just——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). Give you an all-inclusive answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will first answer my question, please.

Now, Mr. Stander, this is testimony which the investigation has produced and which, if true, would mean that you were prominent in the work of the actors' fraction of the Communist Party, having been chairman at least of that fraction of the Communist Party.

Mr. STANDER. Is that your statement?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking you a question.

Mr. STANDER. Oh, I can't follow it.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, I will begin over.

I said: From this testimony, if it is true, it would appear that you had been active among the actors in connection with Communist Party matters and should have considerable knowledge regarding the activities of the Communist Party.

So, I want to ask you the question whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party at any time during the period when you were in California between 1935 and 1948?

Mr. STANDER. This is a continuing committee. I made a statement under oath in 1940. I would like you to read that into the record.

You asked me a question that took about 20 minutes. This will take exactly 3 minutes.

Would you mind reading this?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer my question?

Mr. STANDER. I think——

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer my question, please?

Mr. STANDER. I swore under oath before this committee, in 1940, that I was not a member of the Communist Party. I also——

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you say now?

Mr. STANDER. I also swore in 1940 before the Los Angeles grand jury, its district attorney, and I forced my way in there. I was a voluntary witness, and one of the witnesses used here and John Leech, who was later characterized by Judge Landis as a psychopathic liar, made similar statements to the statements made by Marc Lawrence and others.

I swore under oath before the Los Angeles grand jury and the district attorney—and the district attorney's bureau saw fit to clear me and released a statement to the press absolving me of any participation whatsoever, and the grand jury also cleared me of the charges made before them.

So, I have already been cleared by the district attorney, and the grand jury said I was a fine, patriotic, American citizen.

I am reading from my 1940 testimony——

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). Which is the first time it ever has been released to the press——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). You promised me you would answer the question.

Mr. STANDER (continuing). And the story on that appeared on the front pages of all the Los Angeles newspapers.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. I have sworn under oath in 1940 twice. I swore under oath in an affidavit for the Royal Canadian Air Force and for the United States Air Force.

I worked in a very sensitive spot, in the headquarters' staff, and, from my understanding, it is standard operating procedure to be cleared by the FBI.

I cannot see it would serve the purposes of this committee to ask me about periods during 1934, 1935, and 1936——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. And, incidentally, while you are mentioning that, there's obvious contradictions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, will you——

Mr. STANDER. Miss Ashe said in 1934 she collected dues from me——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). And some people. I wasn't in Hollywood then.

Her husband said it was in 1936.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. And my wife left me in 1935.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander, may I remind you that you have promised to answer the questions——

Mr. STANDER. I have answered.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And now will you——

Mr. STANDER. I have sworn under oath, and if there is any——

Mr. TAVENNER. I haven't asked you what you have done in the past.

Mr. STANDER. If any of these charges be true, why haven't I been indicted?

Mr. VELDE. Will you now answer the question——

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). As to your——

Mr. STANDER. I swore under oath before various governmental agencies, and——

Mr. TAVENNER. That is not my question.

Mr. VELDE. You are before the Un-American Activities Committee at the present time——

Mr. STANDER. That's right.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And will you answer——

Mr. STANDER. And one of your witnesses——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). The questions put by counsel?

Mr. STANDER. I am trying to answer, to the best of my ability.

I was asked a 25-minute question and I can't even give a 2-minute answer. I don't think that is fair.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander, now, I suggested something to you a moment ago. You have been asked a straightforward question as to whether or not you were a Communist during a certain period. Now, answer that——

Mr. STANDER. I swore under oath——

Mr. CLARDY. Yes or no.

Mr. STANDER. I swore——

Mr. CLARDY. Or refuse to answer it on constitutional grounds.

Mr. STANDER. I swore under oath in 1940, and that was covered by this same committee.

Mr. SCHERER. Why don't you swear under oath now whether you were?

Mr. STANDER. You want me to give you the reason?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. STANDER. Because by using psychopaths—and I have the letter here giving the mental history of Marc Lawrence, who came from a mental sanatorium—he suffered a mental breakdown, and I gave you the names of the doctors—and you used that psychopath and used previously this man, Leech, who the district attorney and the grand jury of Los Angeles didn't believe, throughout his charges, and they cleared me—so, I don't want to be responsible for a whole stable of informers, stool pigeons, and psychopaths and ex-political heretics, who come in here beating their breast and say, "I am awfully sorry; I didn't know what I was doing. Please—I want absolution; get me back into pictures," and they will do anything—they will name anybody—they will go to any extent necessary to get back into pictures, and they will mention names and name anybody.

Mr. VELDE. Now, will you answer the question?

Mr. STANDER. Therefore, I decline to answer that question because it clearly is not relevant to the purpose of this committee, and it violates my rights under the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution of the United States.

And, incidentally, don't give me the routine about hiding, because the only people, witnesses, who hide here are witnesses like——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. These people named here, who hide behind the cloak of legal responsibility; and I know, because I tried to get somewhere in the courts of New York, and I find the only people who hide behind immunity are the witnesses, the stool pigeons, used here, and that you are using, arrogating——

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you finished?

Mr. STANDER. No; just let me finish, and I will finish the statement.

My estimation of this committee is that this committee arrogates judicial and punitive powers which it does not possess.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you a Communist today?

Mr. STANDER. No; I am not a Communist today.

If you ask me was I a Communist yesterday—no; I wasn't, and I swore under oath, and it's a matter of public record——

Mr. CLARDY. Were you at any time——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). And I have a passport and I have——

Mr. CLARDY. Were you at anytime ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STANDER. You know that is a trick question to trap me to answer the same question.

I would be an absolute idiot——

Mr. CLARDY. No; I don't think you are.

Mr. STANDER (continuing). To answer that.

Mr. CLARDY. No.

Mr. STANDER. Then, if you don't, you must think I am a political moron.

You are now—do you think I am a political moron, sir?

Mr. CLARDY. I am asking you: Were you ever at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STANDER. My record is absolutely clear.

How many times do I have to swear under oath before governmental agencies—

Mr. CLARDY. Just this once.

Mr. STANDER. And how many times do you have to use my name to get headlines—

Mr. CLARDY. Just this once.

Mr. STANDER. And how many—

Mr. CLARDY. Just this once.

Mr. STANDER. I have already sworn under oath I am not now a member of the Communist Party—

Mr. CLARDY. And never have been?

Mr. STANDER. And I swore in 1940—

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. STANDER. And I swore in 1940 I was never a member of the Communist Party, and never will be; and I would have to be pretty stupid if I swore that in 1940 and know the FBI automatically gets copies of every complaint that I joined the Communist Party later—I would have to be a complete idiot.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask what period of time you are referring to?

Mr. TAVENNER. Between 1935 and 1948.

Mr. BOUDIN. Between what?

Mr. STANDER. I beg your pardon, sir. I've been following you very carefully. You referred to 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1938.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I didn't hear his question.

Mr. STANDER. The testimony of Ashe and Lawrence—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read my question?

Mr. STANDER. You want to repeat that 25-minute question?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; I only asked you a question which did not contain over 15 or 20 words.

Mr. STANDER. It seems to me this is a disgraceful experience for me to have to go through, when I answered and swore under oath in peacetime, and in wartime, when I was of draft age and enlisted in the RCAF, and then for the United States Air Force. This is a terribly disgraceful experience to go through, to be brought here because of these insinuations and accusations, and something which you won't dare charge me with.

You said, and Congressman Dies stated specifically, I was not charged with anything, and this committee says I am not charged with anything—

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, may I—

Mr. STANDER. Yet, you are trying to trick me—

Mr. STANDER (continuing). Into depriving me of my constitutional rights.

You know I swore under oath. If there was any real evidence to refute my sworn testimony, I would be indicted; I wouldn't be brought here before this committee.

And it's 2 years since I requested an appearance—2 years—during which this fanatic group of subversives have blacklisted artists and

are attempting to impose censorship on the free theater that we all believe in and love; and you people have made—are in a way—I don't say consciously—instrumental in aiding them——

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Stander——

Mr. STANDER. Because once you tell——

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STANDER. Once you tell any——

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Stander——

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, members of the committee. I would like to make a statement.

The committee is about to go into recess for 10 minutes.

Now, the committee or some subcommittee will stay here until you finally answer the questions put to you without giving a lot of extraneous material, or decline to answer them——

Mr. STANDER. I was asked a 25-minute question——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). On constitutional grounds.

Mr. STANDER. And you won't even——

Mr. VELDE. Now, Mr. Stander, just a minute. I am talking.

Mr. STANDER. I am—pardon me. I am sorry, sir. I didn't mean to interrupt you until you finished.

Mr. VELDE. I wish you would, Mr. Stander, seriously talk to your counsel and consider answering the questions because this committee has a lot of work to do, we have a lot of other witnesses, and we must hear your testimony that is relevant to the purposes of the committee; and, so, as I said, we will have to stay here indefinitely until we do get your answers to these questions.

Mr. STANDER. In order to clarify that question of 25 minutes, will you please tell me how it's relevant to the purpose of the committee to discover whether or not I swore under oath truthfully in 1940?

Mr. VELDE. The question that was asked you by counsel——

Mr. STANDER. What legislation——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Was not a question——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). Can be gone into——

Mr. VELDE. Now, just a minute.

Mr. STANDER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. The question asked you by counsel was not a 25-minute question by any means. He read some other statements that had been made before this committee. Then he based a very simple question on the facts that he had read, or the testimony that he had read, and the question could be answered very easily.

Now, I wish you would consider, while we are taking this recess, answering the questions.

Mr. STANDER. I just have one simple half-minute statement. The reason why I got so excited was because——

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 11:10 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 11:20 a. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 11:25 a. m., the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, and Clyde Doyle.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. STANDER. Will you turn out the lights?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

Will the television cameras and newsreel cameras please desist?

Will you please turn off the lights and desist from taking further film?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Reporter, I would like for you to read back the question to the witness which I asked—the last question—because the witness indicated some uncertainty as to what the question was.

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

From this testimony, if it is true, it would appear that you had been active among the actors in connection with Communist Party matters and should have considerable knowledge regarding the activities of the Communist Party in that connection. So, I want to ask you the question whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party at any time during the period when you were in California between 1935 and 1948?

Mr. STANDER. I thought my answer was clear, but I'll clarify it and make it simple in one statement.

I decline to answer this under constitutional rights which were just recently reaffirmed by Judge Youngdahl in the Lattimore case.

I have a freedom of belief.

You, as Congressmen, uphold the Constitution and you know that Federal judges have said it is not only your right, but your duty, whenever a congressional committee trespasses upon areas from which it's forbidden to—that it is the duty and right of the citizen to avail themselves of this privilege.

Mr. VELDE. You are declining——

Mr. STANDER. And this is just——

Mr. VELDE. You are declining to answer, Mr. Stander?

Mr. STANDER. Also, under the fifth amendment——

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute. You are declining to answer——

Mr. STANDER. Under the first amendment——

Mr. VELDE. And you have cited legal grounds for your refusal to answer.

Mr. BOUDIN. He hasn't completed his answer.

Mr. STANDER. I haven't completed my answer yet, sir.

Mr. BOUDIN. Can he complete his answer?

Mr. STANDER. I decline under the first amendment, which entitles me to freedom of belief; under the fifth amendment——

Mr. SCHERER. Fifth amendment?

Mr. STANDER. Which states that I shall not be forced to testify against myself, and also in which there is no inference of guilt—it is designed to protect the innocent—and under the ninth amendment, which gives me other rights—for instance, the right to get up in the union hall, which I did, and introduce a right—introduce a resolution condemning this congressional committee for its abuse of powers in attempting to impose censorship upon the American theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Stander——

Mr. BOUDIN. I don't think he has finished.

Mr. STANDER. And, finally, in my estimation, this entire question is not relative to the purposes of this committee, because I can't understand why a question dating back to 1948, 1936, or 1935 concerning statements made by a bunch of stool pigeons and informers can aid this committee in recommending any legislation to Congress, which I understand is the purpose of this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Stander, in the course of the testimony which I read you from Mr. Berkeley, Mr. Martin Berkeley—

Mr. STANDER. I can save the time of the committee—anything else you will ask me, without taking any more time, I will decline to answer on the aforementioned grounds and my constitutional privileges under the first, fifth, and ninth amendments—

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Stander—

Mr. STANDER. Along those—

(At this point Mr. Stander conferred with Mr. Bondin.)

Mr. STANDER. Along those lines.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Stander, you have insisted you made a very earnest request to appear before this committee to answer and explain—

Mr. STANDER. Wait a minute. To answer?

Mr. TAVENNER. Answer and explain matters relating to you.

Mr. STANDER. Answer what?

Mr. TAVENNER. Answer testimony.

Mr. STANDER. Answer charges?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; not charges.

Mr. STANDER. I attempted to do it in the courts, where I am protected by the Anglo-Saxon procedures—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you were—

Mr. STANDER. And under our Constitution, where I can cross-examine and where a witness has complete legal responsibility

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, I understand—

Mr. STANDER. Therefore, I don't choose to pit my word against a psychopathic liar, who was characterized as such by Judge Landis, or a man out of a mental institution, Marc Lawrence, who is a refugee from that case.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Martin Berkeley?

Mr. STANDER. This is getting real—I told you any question along those lines by stool pigeons, informers, psychopathic liars, or anybody—for instance, Mr. Berkeley, I read in the minutes that first he said he was not a member of the Communist Party; then, when he realized you had the goods on him, he came here and rattled off 150 names.

This is, in my idea, an incredible witness.

Mr. VELDE. Do you decline to answer that question?

Mr. STANDER. And I decline to answer—

Mr. TAVENNER. Was—

Mr. BOUDIN. Let him finish.

Mr. STANDER. Under my constitutional rights, which I am proud of, and I resent the inference here that anyone who uses it, which our forefathers fought for, is guilty of anything.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. STANDER. You know this is an ancient right of the American people.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Counsel—

Mr. STANDER. I come from a—my name is Stander. It was adopted in 1913 because, unfortunately, in feudal Spain my ancestors didn't have the protection of the United States Constitution and were religious refugees.

And you know that the Puritans used it—the people that established this country used this right; and I have done a little research on this since you called me, and the first experience of it was——

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question I asked you?

Mr. STANDER. And I am not being sacrilegious—was when Jesus Christ was asked by Pontius Pilate, "These judges have a lot of witnesses against you," and He said nothing.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you a question——

Mr. STANDER. Yes; and I answered the question, and I am a deeply religious man.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Which had nothing to do with religion.

Mr. STANDER. Yes; it does, because that question is designed to trap me. You know, as I stated the first time I swore under oath——

Mr. TAVENNER. You haven't sworn under oath in answer to these questions.

Mr. STANDER. I swore under oath in 1950. I swore under oath before the Los Angeles grand jury, and I don't want to take up the time of the committee—you get me excited—and any questions along that line I will decline to answer on the grounds of constitutional privileges.

Mr. CLARDY. If you don't want to take up the time of the committee, why do you insist on making speeches?

Mr. STANDER. This is not a speech. If I can be asked a 25-minute question, I am entitled to answer——

Mr. CLARDY. Your answer isn't——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). These things which you——

Mr. CLARDY. Along the lines of the question.

Mr. STANDER (continuing). By inference and accusation you accuse me——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). By reference and accusation you accuse with——

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). We go into executive session——

Mr. STANDER (continuing). Because you know this committee can't charge me with anything. You have no judicial power. Your purpose is investigative, and I can't see how any of these questions can aid the committee in its legal purpose, which is to recommend legislation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Martin Berkeley——

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, counsel.

It is very apparent that the witness is excited and nervous, as he stated.

Mr. STANDER. Not as nervous as Marc Lawrence, who came out of a mental institution.

Mr. VELDE. You said you would cooperate with the committee and give it the benefit——

Mr. STANDER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Of your knowledge.

Mr. STANDER. Against the blacklisting——

Mr. VELDE. So, it is the order——

Mr. STANDER. I know of some——

Mr. VELDE. It is the order——

Mr. STANDER. Pardon me. I am sorry.

Mr. VELDE. It is the order of the Chair and this committee that you be continued under subpoena and the investigation and hearing be continued in your case until a future date, at which time you will be notified by our counsel.

Mr. STANDER. May I make one statement now?

Mr. CLARDY. No.

Mr. STANDER. This is precisely what was done in 1940, and I never got any action.

Mr. VELDE. You are dismissed—

Mr. STANDER. All right.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Mr. Stander, for the present.

The committee will be in order, please.

The Chair would like to make a statement.

One of the witnesses who appeared here day before yesterday, Mrs. Dorothy Funn, we understand, has been threatened with bodily harm. For anyone who is interested, Mrs. Funn has been subpoenaed again by this committee and she is now under the jurisdiction of this committee. Any further threats of bodily injury or any type of threat made to Mrs. Funn will be referred to the FBI for immediate investigation.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jay Gorney.

Is Mr. Jay Gorney in the hearing room?

Mr. GORNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the lights be—

Mr. VELDE. Will you be sworn first, please?

Mr. GORNEY. Certainly.

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GORNEY. Yes, sir.

Now, may I please ask, because it disturbs me—I am not an actor, nor am I used to being in front of the public—I am a songwriter—it disturbs me to talk—if you will be good enough to remove the lights.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; the television cameras and the newsreel cameras will be turned off and the lights also turned off.

Mr. GORNEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

TESTIMONY OF JAY GORNEY, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, BELLA ABZUG

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Jay Gorney?

Mr. GORNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell your name?

Mr. GORNEY. J-a-y G-o-r-n-e-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. GORNEY. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify herself for the record?

Mrs. ABZUG. Mrs. Bella Abzug, 205 West 34th Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Gorney?

Mr. GORNEY. I was born in Bialystek, Poland, which was under the Russian czar, in 1896.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to this country?

Mr. GORNEY. In 1906.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. GORNEY. I am a citizen by my father's naturalization.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney reentered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. GORNEY. I am a songwriter and, as a songwriter, I have learned my profession both from a practical standpoint and a theatrical standpoint. In other words, as a songwriter, trying to write songs, it is necessary for me not only to express myself intellectually but emotionally, and perhaps I—I got my first education, I think, in Poland, in a pogrom, where my father decided—we were very little then—to find a land where we could be free—we could have freedom from fear and live a life as a father wants to bring his children and family up.

We came to America in 1906, and we were so grateful and so thankful because when we settled in Detroit—my first schooling was the Detroit public schools. I got my first musical training in the synagogue, singing in the choir; and my training—my formal training—was, I suppose, in the public schools and the Detroit schools. My teachers were wonderful. They were—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, excuse me—

Mr. GORNEY (continuing). Very tolerant.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want to interrupt you.

Mr. GORNEY. I will—

Mr. TAVENNER. You are going a little far afield of my question.

Mr. GORNEY. I apologize, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want only, for the information of the committee, a general statement—

Mr. GORNEY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. About your educational training. Although I haven't asked for it, you gave it.

Mr. GORNEY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. If there is any other formal training, will you give it, please?

Mr. GORNEY. Yes.

Forgive me. I am only trying—

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all right. Just get to the point here.

Mr. GORNEY. I went through the Detroit public schools, and I remember the proudest moment in my life was when my father applied for citizenship and he asked me to prepare him. Having studied history and the questions of citizenship, I told him about the divisions of government and I told him about the President and Vice President, and also what attracted me most was his fear that he would not be able to remember the Bill of Rights, the first amendment to the Constitution, and I—I—being somewhat musical—tried to help him with it, because it's difficult for a person born in another country to learn the words.

And, so, I remember setting the first amendment of the Constitution to a little childish tune, and I sort of sang it for him in trying to get him to memorize.

If you will forgive me, I would like to show you what I mean, because it has a pertinence in my further education.

It went something like this [singing]:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion——

Mr. TAVENNER. I thought you said you were not an actor.

Mr. GORNEY. Beg your pardon. I didn't mean—I am not an actor, believe me. I am trying to be——

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, it is rather unusual for a person to sing a song——

Mr. GORNEY. I understand.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). During the course——

Mr. GORNEY. Well, Mr. Tavenner, you have allowed other singers in this committee from time to time. They have sung long songs—trained pigeons, I call them——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness——

Mr. GORNEY. And they have done quite a little singing.

May I continue?

Mr. SCHERER. Not with a song.

Mr. GORNEY. Well, I will try not to——

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GORNEY. I will try not to——

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GORNEY. Pardon.

Mr. KEARNEY. As far as I am personally concerned, I would like to hear the gentleman give his recitation. We have listened to one character here, and I think the gentleman should be allowed to tell, in his own words, just what his educational advantages were, and how it came about.

Mr. GORNEY. Thank you.

Mr. KEARNEY. I see nothing wrong——

Mr. VELDE. Of course, Mr. Kearney——

Mr. TAVENNER. That is what I was trying to get him to say.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, we have a number of other witnesses we hope will give some information to the committee that we are seeking—and if we had plenty of time, I might like to listen to some musical comedy, or something like that, too.

Mr. GORNEY. I am—this is not musical comedy. This is——

Mr. VELDE. Well, we really should get on with the business of this committee.

Mr. GORNEY. I would like very much to explain.

Mr. VELDE. If you can do it briefly——

Mr. GORNEY. The Bill of Rights means a lot to me.

Mr. VELDE. If you can do it briefly——

Mr. GORNEY. I will try, sir, if you will permit me.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). We would appreciate it very much.

Mr. GORNEY. I want to say the little song I tried to sing, which talked about the freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and so on, had an impression on me at the time not too great because it was a childish memorization; but when I graduated from high school, I went to the University of Michigan, and I was very grateful to my country for allowing me to participate in educational opportunity.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt——

Mr. GORNEY. I studied arts.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). To ask him what year he was at my school?

What year was that?

Mr. GORNEY. I started in 1917, and graduated in 1919.

Mr. CLARDY. You started in—

Mr. GORNEY. I beg your pardon. I started in 1913. I graduated in 1919—1917 and 1919, as I will explain.

Mr. CLARDY. From the literary college there, as I take it?

Mr. GORNEY. From the literary college there, I graduated in 1917; and I was permitted to write, if you recall, Senator, or Congressman—

Mr. CLARDY. That's better.

Mr. GORNEY (continuing). Michigan operas at Michigan. I wrote five of them, and I got my great training—really practical training—about my business of writing music for music shows from the University of Michigan.

Upon graduation in the arts—incidentally. I played my way through school. I had a band and my expense was covered that way. I learned a great deal, and upon graduation from the College of Science and Arts, where I also studied music, the question was what would I do to continue; and since my studies in history—my gratitude to my country was quite intense at the time—I decided to study law.

I entered the law school under Dean Bates, and I recall very distinctly, though I wasn't very good in constitutional law, when the question on the examination paper came, "What is the first amendment to the Constitution?" I was very delighted that I remembered that little tune—"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of," and all about freedom of speech and all about the rights of the people.

Mr. CLARDY. You were probably the only member in the class who really remembered it.

Mr. GORNEY. I think so.

It is a difficult thing. Nevertheless, that Constitution of the United States of ours is a very beautiful thing. The full implication didn't come to me at the time because it said the first amendment came first. Apparently our Founding Fathers intended that to be the most important thing in the thing.

Well, I graduated in law, and still interested in music, of course, and upon graduation I found I just didn't have the wherewithal—I didn't think I was good enough—to be a lawyer, because music was my foreground, my important foreground, and, so, with a bundle of music I came to New York; and after some struggle as a songwriter—it's not easy to please the public—and some experience, I got a contract with the Shuberts and started writing various musical shows. Among them were Top Hold, The Greenwich Village Follies, Merry-Go-Round, Vanities, Sketchbook. I don't recall many more.

Finally, in 1931, too, I wrote a show called Americana, and among them were various songs—love songs, comedy songs—the kind of things you write in musical shows—but in America, I mean Americana, I think I probably wrote the song that I am best known for, and that is Brother, Can You Spare a Dime?

At that time I got a call to come to Hollywood to write songs for a picture called Stand Up and Cheer, at Fox Studios, and while there I am credited with having discovered a little personality, for whom I wrote a song called Baby Take a Bow—I brought her to pictures—a little personality named Shirley Temple.

And later I did other pictures—the music for other pictures—like *Lottery Lover*, *Red Heads on Parade*, in New York. I also did a picture called *Moonlight and Pretzels*.

And back in Hollywood I did, oh, *College Holiday*—a lot of—some good; some inconsequential—and, finally, for Columbia I did a picture called *Hey, Rookie*, and *Gay Senorita*.

But I must say, gentlemen, this sort of rounds out my education in a way, and I find myself here today recalling the first amendment to the Constitution. It doesn't feel very much like the major key—I feel like singing in the minor key—and, yet, there is hope in our country and, with the goodness of what is given us here through our Constitution, I feel very much encouraged when I hear of people like Governor—ex-Governor Lehman upholding the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; again when I hear of Chief—of Justice Youngdahl fighting for the Bill of Rights, particularly the first amendment, the freedom to speak and—

Mr. VELDE. Well, now, you are getting into—

Mr. GORNEY. And I am very much encouraged, I say—

Mr. VELDE. A lecture. All the members of this committee—

Mr. GORNEY. Forgive me. I tried—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Uphold the Constitution.

Mr. GORNEY (continuing). To be brief, as I realize—

Mr. VELDE. So, let's—

Mr. GORNEY. I am sure we are all trying for the same—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Proceed with the orderly—

Mr. GORNEY. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Taking of this testimony from this witness, if you will, please.

Mr. GORNEY. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the practice of your profession take you to Hollywood?

Mr. GORNEY. Yes, sir; I said it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you there?

Mr. GORNEY. I think I came to Hollywood about 1936, and returned to New York in 1947. I came back to do shows.

I forget to mention I did two shows in New York since then. One was called *Heaven on Earth*, which was not a success; and another one which was called *Thank You, Just Looking*, which I wrote music for a review at Catholic University in Washington, which later became a New York review entitled *Touch and Go*, which played a season in New York and a little less than a year in London.

I think that is about the round-out of my works.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received testimony during the course of its investigation in Hollywood which, if true, would mean that you have a knowledge of Communist Party activities within the entertainment field there.

(At this point Mr. Gorney conferred with Mrs. Abzug.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I am referring to the testimony of Mr. Leo Townsend, Mr. Martin Berkeley, and Mrs. Charles Daggett.

Mr. Leo Townsend testified that he, himself, was a member of the Communist Party between 1944 and 1948, and he advised the committee that Jay and Sandra Gorney were also members of that branch with him.

Mr. Gorney was a songwriter, according to his testimony.

Were you a member of a branch of the Communist Party in Hollywood at any time between 1944 and 1948?

MR. GORNEY. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Tavenner, because it is, in the first place, in the first amendment; it is also—it also abridges the sixth amendment, in which the testimony of cooperative witnesses—whatever you want to call them—without a chance for cross examination, or having witnesses appear in my behalf—it seems to me testimony of that kind answers nothing; and if you will multiply three by nothing, it equals nothing, and I don't—I refuse to answer that question, sir, because under the fifth amendment I have the privilege of invoking it in refusing to be—to be a witness against myself.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of Communist Party activities during the period you were in Hollywood?

MR. GORNEY. I think I'll stand on the fifth amendment.

MR. VELDE. Then, you do decline to answer—

MR. GORNEY. I decline—

MR. VELDE (continuing). The question?

MR. GORNEY (continuing). To answer.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

MR. GORNEY. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in light of the witness' answer, I see no cause to be served by reading the testimony of the other witnesses.

MR. VELDE. Yes; I agree.

I would like to ask one question. Are you presently a member of the Communist Party?

MR. GORNEY. I refuse to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

MR. VELDE. Do you have any questions, Mr. Kearney?

MR. KEARNEY. Well, just one: If you were not a member or had not been a member of the Communist Party, would you so state?

MR. GORNEY. Would you state that again, please?

MR. KEARNEY. I said: If you had not been a member of the Communist Party, would you so state?

MR. GORNEY. I decline to answer that on the ground of the fifth, sir.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

MR. CLARDY. One question.

MR. GORNEY. Yes, sir.

MR. CLARDY. Were you in any way associated with the Communist movement while you were a student at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor?

MR. GORNEY. It's so—

(At this point Mr. Gorney conferred with Mrs. Abzug.)

MR. GORNEY. It's so long—so long ago, sir, that—in the study of my profession, writing for the Michigan operas, and so forth, being very young and very much of a—interested in what the studies were there—there was very little time, and I have to answer by refusing to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

MR. CLARDY. Isn't the subject of whether you were or were not a member of the Communist movement of sufficient importance so that it would have been indelibly impressed on your memory?

I say that because the first half of your answer, or the first three-quarters of it, was an attempt to plead that you didn't remember.

Now, don't you think that that is a subject of such great importance that you would remember?

Divorce that from the other—

Mr. GORNEY. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Half of your answer.

Mr. GORNEY. Yes. I gather the import of your question, but my interest was in the studies at the time—history, sociology, music, rhetoric. I was struggling with trying to become a person at that time. My interests were entirely in my—the question of getting an education.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, now, you know the Russians took over in 1917. You recall that, when the Communists took over in Russia?

Mr. GORNEY. That's historically a fact.

Mr. CLARDY. Were you at all acquainted with the Communist movement in the years immediately following that while you were still at the university?

Mr. GORNEY. I presume we've read about it in the papers. It wasn't very much of an impact. That was not a period of too much newspaper reading.

What class were you in, Representative?

Mr. CLARDY. Never mind. I graduated a little later.

Mr. GORNEY. I don't think so. I think we probably may have been classmates. I don't know.

Mr. CLARDY. You might tell me what operas you wrote. Then I will know.

Mr. GORNEY. You know, Congressman, it's like reading old letters—you hate them—the things you have written in your youth.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, they might have been good.

Mr. GORNEY. Well, I don't think so. They were very experimental.

Mr. CLARDY. All right, let it go.

That is all.

I will talk to you off the record.

Mr. GORNEY. Gladly, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHIERER. I have no questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. If there any reason why this witness should be continued further under subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness is dismissed and the committee will stand in recess until 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 1:30 p. m. of the same day, the hearing was resumed, the following committee members being present: Representatives Bernard W. Kearney (presiding), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.)

Mr. KEARNEY. The committee will be in order.

Counsel, have you a witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Robert Gladnick.

Will you stand to be sworn, sir?

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Gladnick, do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GLADNICK. I do, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let the record show that the following committee members are present: Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and Mr. Kearney, a quorum of the committee

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT GLADNICK

M. KUNZIG. Mr. Gladnick, are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. GLADNICK. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. You know, of course, of your right before this committee to be accompanied by counsel, if you so desire?

Mr. GLADNICK. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you are satisfied to testify without counsel?

Mr. GLADNICK. I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give your full name and address, sir?

Mr. GLADNICK. Robert Gladnick, 2532 Greenvale Road, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Gladnick, would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background, your birth, and your schooling?

Mr. GLADNICK. I was born in 1914 in Russia.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where was that in Russia?

Mr. GLADNICK. The city of Vyazma, the Province of Smolensk.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell those two names, please, sir?

Mr. GLADNICK. It's as easy as Smith in England—V-y-a-z-m-a—and the province is Smolensk—S-m-o-l-e-n-s-k.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Gladnick, would you spell your name, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. G-l-a-d-n-i-c-k.

Mr. KEARNEY. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you speak as loudly as possible, of course, and perhaps pull your chair up a bit?

Thank you.

Now, would you state your educational background?

You were stating that.

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I have a formal education up to the ninth grade. After that, my education has been picked up at random.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you, then, give the committee, Mr. Gladnick, your employment experience; your background?

Mr. GLADNICK. About the age of 14, 15, I went on the road; more or less rode around in boxcars, and hoboed; worked in oil fields, and harvest fields, lumber camps; then became a seaman—merchant seaman.

I spent 2 years in Spain, came back to this country in 1938 and became an organizer for the Textile Workers' Union, CIO, with 6—5½ years in the Canadian Army.

When I returned, I went to work with a union—my present union.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your citizenship status, sir?

Mr. GLADNICK. I am a citizen of the United States of America.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present employment—I want to get that clear for the record—where you presently are working?

Mr. GLADNICK. I am an organizer for the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union in the Ohio and Kentucky area.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Gladnick, how and under what circumstances did you first become interested in the Young Communist League?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, when I returned from Russia in 1928, a number of young fellows in the southern Bronx were interested to know about my experiences in Russia, and I told them, on and off, what I saw there. However, I never became a Communist until I was riding around the roads, and I joined the party in Houston, Tex.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was that?

Mr. GLADNICK. That was about February or March of 1931.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were you doing down there in Houston, Tex.?

Mr. GLADNICK. I was working as a roustabout around the oil fields.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you in any way get active in trying to get members for the Communists?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I was—or helping to organize the unemployed councils there for the Communists. However, I didn't get to know too much about communism in Texas at that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the period of time as evidenced in the Daily Worker of August 22, 1933, where there is an article entitled "Unemployed Leaders Beaten in Oklahoma City":

Robert Gladnick and William Williamson, leaders of the unemployed here, were arrested and beaten by leather belts by local police for leading a strike of RFC workers.

This action has aroused local workers who are demanding the arrest and prosecution of those guilty of the assault. Williamson has stated he can identify the attackers.

Will you tell us a bit about that?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, this didn't occur at the time we are talking about because I joined the unemployed in Houston, Tex., in 1931. This was in 1933.

As I recall, I was helping to organize the unemployed, and the people down there are a little hot-blooded, and I couldn't give them a dialectical talk to make them quiet, and they went out, and they went out and got out of hand a little bit; and, of course, I had to suffer the consequences.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, when you were a leader of labor, as it says there, were you at that time working also for the Communist Party?

Mr. GLADNICK. I was district organizer of the Young Communist League.

Mr. KUNZIG. And was the activity of the Communist Party, shall we say, twisted up with this, or one and the same with this strike situation?

Mr. GLADNICK. It was.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you associated with any other members of the Communist Party down there at that time?

Mr. GLADNICK. I was.

Mr. KUNZIG. And, if so, can you remember who they were?

Mr. GLADNICK. In 1931 or 1933—

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's start with 1931 first; then go to 1933.

Mr. GLADNICK. In 1931 I knew a Mrs. Abrams, whose party name is Ames.

I knew an A. W. Berry. He is a Negro worker, whom I have very high respect for his bravery, although not for his political acumen.

There was A. W. Berry.

Then, after that, in 1932, I remember—1932 and 1933— a Hy Gordon and Alice Wilson, who was Mrs. Gordon.

Then there was Williams, but Williams quit the Communist Party afterward.

Then, there was a Knight.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell that?

Mr. GLADNICK. K-n-i-g-h-t; but I don't remember his first name.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, all these people you knew as members of the Communist Party; is that correct?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know at that period a Gil Green—G-i-l-G-r-e-e-n—or a Betty Gannett—G-a-n-n-e-t-t?

Mr. GLADNICK. I knew a Gil Green. When I came back to New York, I met Gil Green. He was head of the Young Communist League in 1931—national head. I knew a Betty Gannes, who was his wife, or supposedly his wife.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know them as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, Gil Green I knew only as national secretary of the Young Communist League and a member of the executive committee of the Communist Party or Communist International—of the Young Communist International.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Gladnick, would you say that the officials or the high people in the Young Communist League and the Communist Party were interested in you because of your birth in Russia and having been in Russia?

Mr. GLADNICK. No; I don't think they were interested in that. In fact, they held it against me because at that time most of the Young Communists who were likely—who were potential—as far as the high leadership was concerned—as future members of the armed forces, and not being an American, it was more or less a detriment to their plans.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you elaborate a little bit on this statement that you are talking about now and the type of work that you did in New York—

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I—

Mr. KUNZIG (Continuing). Mentioning perhaps the Brooklyn Navy Yard, if you would.

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, you see, the 21 points of admission to the Communist International states specifically that the individual Communist Parties all over the world must carry on work within the armed forces of their respective capitalist—quote—countries—in

brackets—countries. That is my own quote. And since the Young Communist League is a youth branch of the Communist Party, most of the activity within the armed forces were carried on primarily at that time, as far as I knew, to the best of my knowledge, through the Young Communist League; and they would plant people into the armed services, such as the Citizens' Military Training Corps, National Guard, such civilian military establishments as the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's take the CMTC since you just mentioned it. Did you, yourself, go into the CMTC?

Mr. GLADNICK. I did, in 1932. I, with a group of around 30 or 40 Young Communists, were members of the Citizens' Military Training Corps.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let me ask you if you went in under your own name.

Mr. GLADNICK. No; I didn't.

Mr. KUNZIG. Why not?

Mr. GLADNICK. Because I wasn't a native-born citizen.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, you mean you took another name to go into the CMTC—

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). So that you could get into it?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain a little about what was done then in the CMTC from the standpoint of the Young Communists that went into it?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, the object of getting Young Communists into the CMTC was twofold:

No. 1: It gave the Young Communists the experience of arms.

It also gave the Young Communists a chance to find out if they liked military life; and, if they did, they were then put into the other armed forces, such as the National Guard or the Regular Army or Navy.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you remember any names of various people with whom you were associated at that time who went or were sent into the CMTC as Young Communists?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, the chap who was in charge of sending the Young Communists into the CMTC was a fellow by the name of—I knew him as Charles—Charley Wilson. He was then the head of the Young Communist League group for penetrating the armed forces. In fact, he was supposed to become the Secretary of Defense if the United States ever became Communist.

I see where somebody who has a different middle initial has become Secretary of National Defense.

Well, Charley Wilson was the so-called Secretary of National Defense as far as the Communists were concerned, and his name is Irving Velson.

Mr. KUNZIG. His name is—

Mr. GLADNICK. His real name is Irving Velson.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let me get that spelling very clearly—the spelling of the first name you mentioned.

Mr. GLADNICK. Wilson—W-i-l-s-o-n.

Mr. KUNZIG. W-i-l-s-o-n?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Charles Wilson?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes, and his real name, I found out later, is Irving Velson.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is V-e-l-s-o-n?

Mr. GLADNICK. V-e-l-s-o-n; yes.

Now, to continue on that, there was George Gorchoff. He was actually in charge of the entire Young Communist legal unit.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's get the spelling of Gorchoff.

Mr. GLADNICK. George, as George, and Gorchoff—I think it's G-o-r-s-c-h-o-f-f, but I'm not positive of that.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was Gorchoff's position?

Mr. GLADNICK. He was actually head of the unit or nucleus within the CMTC in 1932 at Camp Dix. He was a member of the red course—red course meaning second-year man. He was a machine-gunner, and they were scattered throughout—primarily throughout the three companies coming from Brooklyn, the Bronx, and Manhattan approximately, around thirty-or-some-odd Young Communists.

There was a fellow by the name of Nat Wald, whose name I later used, whose YCL name was Nat Young.

Mr. KUNZIG. Wait a minute. Nat Wald is N-a-t, and the last name—W-a-l-d?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right. His Young Communist League name was Nat Young.

And I can't recall any other people there.

Mr. MOULDER. When you refer to red course, you don't mean Communist course?

Mr. GLADNICK. No; no. That was the machine—the basic course has no color. The basic course is machineguns; then there was a white course and a blue course—

Mr. MOULDER. Blue course, and—

Mr. GLADNICK. And after that you got your commission.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you just mentioned you used the name of Nat Wald, his documents, and so forth. Would you tell the committee just what that was for, and under what circumstances you used that name?

Mr. GLADNICK. In 1935, when I shipped out in the merchant marine, I used Nat Wald's birth certificate in order to obtain a seaman's passport.

You had to be a citizen in order to sail under American-flag ships.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, in other words, was this a fairly easy procedure for you to do something like this?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, it didn't take me—it didn't seem very hard. I sent away to the board of health a dollar or two, and they mailed me back the birth certificate, and then I went up to the Communist Party headquarters, and the editor of the Sunday Worker—I think his name was Raymond, or Al Richmond, or Al Raymond—at the present time it's—it's one or the other. Now, I'm not positive. As far as I know, he is—he later became editor of the People's World out on the west coast. He went out and made out for me seaman's papers.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, was this type of action normal for members of the Communist Party when they wanted to get into any group from which they might otherwise be barred?

Mr. GLADNICK. It seemed to be—I mean, they advised me, and they seemed to know all the procedure.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, the use of false documents meant nothing to them?

Mr. GLADNICK. No, sir; none at all.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could you give the committee a little further information along this line—on the situation of going down to the public library, and so forth, and picking names out?

I believe we discussed that.

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, it was common knowledge amongst the Communists at that time—when I say Communists, I mean those who were connected with the so-called Armed Forces group, as it was called, the antidepartment of the party, that the New York Public Library had a book of vital statistics, and if somebody needed a false passport or false birth certificate he simply went down and looked through the book for the year in which that particular person was born, and a likely person, and he just picked out a name. On the basis of that name, they would send away the information to the board of health and receive the birth certificate.

Mr. KUNZIG. A few moments ago you were talking about the period of time when you were in Texas. I believe you were also in Oklahoma; is that right?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you describe the type of work you did in Oklahoma and the time and period you were there?

Mr. GLADNICK. We, on behalf of the Communist Party, were trying to organize the packinghouse workers into the Packinghouse Workers' Industrial Union, which was an affiliated trade union of the Trade Union Unity League. We tried to organize the oilfield workers into the Oil Field Industrial Workers' Union, an affiliate of the TUUL, which was also an affiliate of the Red International Labor Union, a Moscow-controlled union.

We tried to organize the unemployed, and the unemployed at that time had plenty to—plenty grievances; and although there were other organizations in the field trying to organize the unemployed, we tried to steal them away from them into the Communist unemployed councils.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, we passed over fairly quickly the fact that you had been in the merchant marine. While in the merchant marine, did you work for the Communist Party?

Mr. GLADNICK. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. If so, in what way, Mr. Gladnick?

Mr. GLADNICK. I was a member of the waterfront faction of the Young Communist League, and our main—

Mr. KUNZIG. When was this?

Mr. GLADNICK. This was 1935 and 1936.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Mr. GLADNICK. And our main job at that time was to break up the International Seamen's Union or take it over, which was an American Federation of Labor union—

Mr. KUNZIG. Was that—

Mr. GLADNICK (continuing). And the Communists—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Done?

Mr. GLADNICK (continuing). Succeeded.

Mr. KUNZIG. They succeeded?

Mr. GLADNICK. The Communists succeeded in taking it over.

Mr. KUNZIG. Completely destroyed and took over the union?

Mr. GLADNICK. Completely destroyed it. Completely destroyed the ISU—the International Seamen's Union.

However, I left the country when they reformed at that time the National Maritime Union, and in its inception it was completely controlled by the Communists. However, I would like to add, to the best of my knowledge, Joe Curran has cleaned them out of the NMU now.

Mr. KUNZIG. For what purpose was the union at that time used by the Communists?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, the Communists had many reasons for getting in on the waterfront. First of all, it was a question of leading a segment of the American trade-union movement, but it was very important. It was a concentration area, because the maritime industry is the Achilles' heel of American industry, because you could throttle the American war potential, American industrial potential, by calling a strike or sabotaging the waterfront.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Gladnick, did you at one time go to California?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes; I did, in 1934—and in 1933, 1934, and 1935.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask how they destroyed the union, Mr. Chairman?

That wasn't discussed or thoroughly explained.

Mr. GLADNICK. How did they destroy the union?

Well, in 1936—1935—the International Seamen's Union had come into existence in 1934. Well, the Communists—no matter how much the officials of the union tried to get for the workers, the Communists always asked for more. So, of course, in labor relations and bargaining, you can't always get what you want.

And I will say that in retrospect the officialdom of the International Seamen's Union at that time was rather—well, they weren't very well experienced. They had only had the union in existence for about a year. As far as actual organization, there was—it was a paper organization before that, but in 1934 they grew, flesh and body, because the majority of American seamen joined it.

However, in their attempts to negotiate with the employers—no matter what they would get from the employers, the Communists would incite the seamen to ask for more; and, of course, conditions were pretty bad on the waterfront and everybody wanted more; and by this constant lack of acceptance of any contract, anything that the leadership of the union was able to get, they were able to call what they called rank-and-file strikes.

So, in other words, after awhile industry was not—had no labor peace in it. No matter what the union officials settled the contract for, they could not guarantee the ships would sail because the wildcat strikes would tie up the ships and harbor.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could I, then, go to your work for the Communists in California?

Would you describe that in some detail to the committee?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, when I arrived in California, I didn't know many of the Communists there and I went to a friend of mine whom—that is, Communists—party-controlled member—Joe Springer, who I knew in New York as Joe Saul.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you—

Mr. CLARDY. Spell that.

Pardon me.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell Saul?

Mr. GLADNICK. S-a-u-l.

Mr. KUNZIG. And how do you spell Springer?

Mr. GLADNICK. S-p-r-i-n-g-e-r.

Mr. CLARDY. You knew him under the name of Saul in New York?

Mr. GLADNICK. In New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. Which was his real name and which was an alias, if you know?

Mr. GLADNICK. To the best of my knowledge, Springer is his real name and Saul is his Communist Party name.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Would you continue, please.

Mr. KEARNEY. Wait a minute.

Pardon me.

Whereabouts did he live in New York; do you know?

Mr. GLADNICK. In New York—I could only give you the approximate area—he lived near Leggett Avenue in the Bronx, either on Beak, Kelly, or Fox Street—in that general vicinity——

Mr. CLARDY. Will you identify——

Mr. GLADNICK. Along Leggett Avenue, on one of those streets.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, will you identify the period in which he knew him in New York under the name of Saul?

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you please do that?

Mr. GLADNICK. I knew him as Saul during the months of January, February, March, April, May, right up until about the month of October 1932.

Mr. MOULDER. How did you know him under that name?

Mr. GLADNICK. He was the head—he was the unit organizer of the Young Communist League unit.

Mr. MOULDER. He went by that name and presented himself to you by that name?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, he was our head of that unit. His name was Joe Saul.

Mr. CLARDY. And he was engaged in what type of work at that time?

Mr. GLADNICK. He was a cloakmaker.

Mr. CLARDY. Was he still in that work when you knew him in California?

Mr. GLADNICK. He was.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you were discussing your activities, and you went to——

Mr. SCHERER. Pardon me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Before we get off the subject of Joe Springer and Joe Saul——

Mr. KUNZIG. I am coming back to that.

Mr. SCHERER. Are you coming back to it later?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Oh, all right.

Mr. KUNZIG. You said you had gone to the home of Joe Springer.

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you carry on from there, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, while I was there, I met some other California Communists, who I didn't know, and we started talking about New York; and it happened in passing that they asked me who did I know in New York, and I mentioned Shavey Wilson, which is Charley Wilson's name amongst those inner—in the inner circles.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, is Shavey spelled S-h-a-v-e-y?

Mr. GLADNICK. I don't know how Shavey is spelled, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you tell us how the name Shavey Wilson or Velson got into the picture?

Mr. GLADNICK. To the best of my knowledge, Young Communist League fellows kidded him about how long it took him to shave. It had something to do with that.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, Shavey Velson and Charles Wilson are one and the same person?

Mr. GLADNICK. Except that he was known not as Shavey Wilson, but he was known as Shavey.

Mr. KUNZIG. Shavey?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Mr. GLADNICK. He was known by the innermost circles as Shavey.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Did you know him as Shavey?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes; I knew him by Shavey.

So, when I mentioned Shavey—used that name, he immediately—Lou Schneiderman immediately called me outside and said, "Look, don't get in touch with anybody locally because the industrial squad of Red Hines"—police officer in Los Angeles at that time—seemed to know more about the Communist Party than the section organizer, and he asked me to avoid any contacts whatsoever, and then he'll get in touch with me.

Well, it seems he wrote to Velson to find out who I was, and Velson seemed to have given him the O. K., and then he immediately got me into an activity of trying to organize and propagandize in the United States Fleet, which was stationed at that time in Long Beach, Calif.—San Pedro and Long Beach, as well as San Diego.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, I am sure the committee would be more than interested in hearing in detail just what you mean, Mr. Gladnick, about organizing for the Communist Party within the United States Fleet. So, would you please explain that?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, at that time Schneiderman told me there were certain contacts within the fleet. He turned over to me, and I can't recall his name but he was a second-class fireman, and I think he came from Ogden, Utah, aboard the U. S. S. *New York*, who was a member of the Young Communist League; and it was my job to keep in touch with him, to guide him, pass literature to him, and then he told me that there was also an officer aboard the *Pennsylvania*, and that was his contact. I never got to meet the man.

Now, at that time, at that particular period, there was a general 10-percent cut for all Federal employees in effect. It was our job to go aboard these various battleships to find out what the sentiment of the navymen was in regards to the pay cuts, and our job then was to issue a newspaper, which we did.

We put out a newspaper called the Shipmates' Voice—the best that I could recall it. It may have been the Sailors' Voice, but I think it

was called the Shipmates' Voice. Schneiderman and I had it printed. We wrote most of the articles for it.

We had it printed. We made sure that we didn't have it printed anywhere in any of the Communist printing places. We went to a Mexican place that put out newspapers for supermarkets, and the reason we picked this Mexican place was because we decided the owner was not too well versed in the English language. He put out this newspaper. After it was finished, we destroyed the type, and we turned this—turned over this newspaper to a legal—or open member of the Communist Party.

In Los Angeles at that time the Young Communist League had a special mobilization on a Sunday, where all—primarily the young girls—they all showed up at a certain given spot. They were all handed this newspaper, and they went aboard the battleships and distributed it in the lockers and passageways, and in that way, in one swoop, 5,000 copies of the Shipmates' Voice covered every ship in the fleet.

On those ships where the Communists had contacts very few papers were given out. The intention was to create the impression that it is the other ship that has the Communists; and on the ships where we had this contact—these contacts—we gave out very few—not to let them look innocent, but at the same time not to point suspicion—point suspiciously to them.

Now, after we put out this newspaper the fleet moved to the east coast, and Schneiderman went to Cuba—anyway, he told me he went to Cuba—and put out a second edition of this paper called the Shipmates' Voice, with the aid of the Young Communist League of Cuba, which was distributed with their aid—probably with their girls' aid at Guantanamo Bay.

I came to New York, and I contacted Velson and a Dodo, whose name is Malken—he also worked in the Brooklyn Navy Yard—George Gorchoff, and we put out a third edition of this paper, which was printed in the Finnish Federation Press on 50 East 13th Street.

The reason I know where it was printed—we were there to make sure no spare copies were left around.

There was also a mobilization of the female members of the Young Communist League in New York, and they also went aboard the various ships and distributed in New York City. This was around Decoration Day of 1934.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would it be correct to say that Shavey Velson, or Shavey, was in charge of the entire military apparatus for the Young Communist League?

Mr. GLADNICK. For the Young Communist League, I would say to the best of my knowledge, he was in charge under Peters.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that J. Peters?

Mr. GLADNICK. J. Peters.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you tell the committee what you know of J. Peters?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, after the fleet left in June of 1934, I, this young sailor, this second-class fireman, who took his furlough and was in civilian clothes, and another chap by the name of Gene Morse took a special course on work within the Armed Forces. We attended this course during the daytime at 50 East 13th Street in the Workers' School, and the course was taught to the three of us by Mendel, or

Mindel—Profesor Mindel—Professor Markoff—anyway, they called him professor, and also J. Peters personally took over teaching us how to do cipher work and communications.

Mr. DOYLE. How to do what work?

Mr. GLADNICK. Cipher work—how to write letters without anybody knowing what you were writing.

Mr. DOYLE. How were you going to use that knowledge?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, that was in case one of us was sent to San Pedro or to Norfolk, or any Army base, and we wanted to send reports back. We were to send the reports back in cipher, rather than in the same language.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you, in the city of New York, at Communist Party headquarters in New York, were taught how to operate in cipher and code—

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right, and Peters—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In order that you, a member of the Communist Party, working in the American Navy, could send secret code messages back to the National Communist Party in New York—

Mr. GLADNICK. Well—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Dealing with internal security matters of the United States Navy?

Mr. GLADNICK. Primarily it was dealing with the work and activities of the Young—or the Communist Party members within the Armed Forces—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, why—

Mr. GLADNICK. But primarily you are correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Why would you want to use secret code to report back to the American Communist Party in New York as to what activities were being propagandized by the Young Communist League?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I don't think Peters wanted the whole world to know what the Young Communist League was doing in the Army or Navy.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, what were they doing?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, they were trying to organize cells.

Mr. DOYLE. Secretly?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, all indications, as far as I was concerned—as far as I knew, it was secret. They were not open party units. In other words, they never held open meetings of any sort.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, the American Communist Party was organizing secret units and using secret codes and cipher codes from the American battleships back to the Communist Party headquarters in New York?

Mr. GLADNICK. No; they were not cipher code from the battleships. Let me give you an example.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, about what was going on in the battleships?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

It was a very elementary system. They would tell us to have certain copies of a western magazine, a love story, True Romance, and all we did on the letter was put down the date, and we would put in that, and then we would mark and number, which meant the page, and all you did was simply put a dot under the word you wanted, and they would buy the same copy of the magazine I would buy, and I would simply follow that procedure.

In that way, if we, you and I or anybody else ever raided our room, they would find a bunch of western magazines, True Romances, and no copies of the Daily Worker.

MR. DOYLE. And at what address in New York were you taught that?

MR. GLADNICK. Well, it was taught at that time at 50 East 13th Street by J. Peters himself.

MR. KUNZIG. Then—

MR. SCHERER. Just a minute.

MR. KUNZIG. Pardon me, sir.

MR. SCHERER. Mr. Gladnick, I was going to ask you this later, but in view of your testimony so far I want to ask you one or two questions.

In this month's Mercury there is an article entitled "Red Threat to American Industry." Now, in this article, there is a reprint of one of the directives of the Communist Party emanating from Moscow entitled "The ABC of Sabotage," and I am going to read to you from that directive which is reprinted in this article to which I have referred and ask you whether or not your experience in the labor field of the Communist Party indicates that some of these directives were carried out. I think from your testimony so far it does so indicate, but I am going to ask you that question.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

MR. SCHERER (continuing). Now, this directive reads, in part, as follows—and it is entitled "The ABC of Sabotage":

To All Political Instructors, Communist Auxiliary Organizations, Leaders of Communist Factions in Trade Unions, and All Sabotage Units:

The organization of action committees in all armament and munitions factories, in commercial and naval shipyards, in railroad centers, in all harbors and on all ships trading from American ports: These action committees should be composed of the most militant and reliable elements. The duty of the action committees is to distribute antiwar literature, call antiwar meetings, carry on daily discussions among the workers, organize strikes and otherwise obstruct the manufacture and transport of war materials.

* * * the organization of Red vigilante committees everywhere to check and report on armament orders and consignments of war materials. The vigilante committees should consist only of tested comrades. Their special duty is to gather exact information on the amounts and quality of war goods ordered, on the dates of their shipment—names of ships, railroad schedules, photographs of labels on packing cases and freight cars—and reliable data on the destination of such war transports.

* * * intensified activity in the formation of Communist nuclei in naval shipyards and aboard warships, in the National Guard, the CCC camps, the Coast Guard, and in all branches of the Army. The chief task of these nuclei should be the demoralization and the undermining of discipline of soldiers and sailors.

Does that sound familiar to you?

MR. GLADNICK. It sounds like the text I was studying from back in 1934.

MR. SCHERER. Now, while we are on this, I am going to read a little further, because I think it is important:

Our chief means for the obstruction of the manufacture and transport of war materials is the strike. Every strike, although begun by advancing minor economic demands in behalf of the workers, is a high form of political combat. The only higher forms of political combat are armed demonstrations and armed insurrections.

This directive continues:

(a) Mobilize all available forces. Strikes do not "break out." Strikes must be prepared by a militant minority.

(b) Strive to provoke violent clashes between strikers and police. Police violence is the course of strikes helps to impart a political character to the struggle, thus lifting it to a higher plane of revolutionary warfare.

Then it goes on:

The fundamental principle of sabotage consists of finding the most vulnerable link in the process of production or transport—and to slash it at a time when it is needed most by the class enemy. The use of fire and explosives—the burning or blasting of munitions factories and ships, the blasting of railroads, strategic bridges—should be limited to centrally planned, large-scale actions. Instructors will be assigned to special groups to train them in the use of explosives.

Several methods may be used to start fires in factories, storage depots, or ships' holds. The use of rags soaked in kerosene is the simplest and cheapest. They can easily be thrown through windows, air shafts, hatches, or through the ventilators into ships' holds. * * *

I am going to go on, Mr. Chairman, if I may——

Mr. KEARNEY. How much——

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Because I think——

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). Longer have you got there?

Mr. SCHERER. Well, I may come back to it, because I think it is important.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I suggest we let counsel finish his questioning, and then we can——

Mr. GLADNICK. Can I comment on what the Congressman read?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Please do.

Mr. GLADNICK. Actual schools of sabotage that I know of existing in the Communist Party were conducted in Spain by a Russian intelligence officer called Colonel Belayev.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you spell that, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. B-e-l-a-y-e-v.

His recruiter from American ranks was Bob Minor, who would, in his stead, go to Irving Regenstreif, or presently known as Johnny Gates—or John Gates—editor of the Daily Worker, who was then a political commissar. He would turn over key Americans to this man.

Now, mind you, this was not a school, a regular part of the regular Spanish Army. It was not the International Brigades that fought openly and on the battlefield. This was a special group whose entire purpose was to learn commando-ranger tactics, work behind the lines.

However, the majority of them never went behind Franco's lines in Spain. These people became automatically subject to discipline of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, not the American Communist Party, though they were Communists.

And when you speak of that—that is the general directive.

But the key people who are—who would be actually in charge of this work would be those men recruited by Gates, turned over to Minor, who would in turn turn them over to Colonel Belayev of the Soviet Military Mission.

Mr. SCHERER. And find their way——

Mr. GLADNICK. Then they would find their way back to the United States, and many of the graduates of that school are here.

Mr. SCHERER. They are here?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. All right, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Gladnick, when did you sever your connections with the Communist Party?

Mr. GLADNICK. The first time I met a Russian in Spain.

Mr. KUNZIG. The first time you met a Russian in Spain?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you describe that a bit further, please, sir?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I was infantry officer of the International Brigade, full of life, sturdy, filthy, having been up to the front with some hectic battles, and I was promoted upstairs into the Russian military mission, and upon arrival there the Russians didn't even want to talk to me until I was scrubbed, bathed, manicured, and put into some of the most gorgeous clothes I ever wore in my life. Having been an old-time radical and brought up in the equalitarian ideals of radicalism, I just couldn't stomach the high standards of living of the Russians and I immediately changed my political views.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean the Russian officers—

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, you see, the Russian officers constantly harping to me that they are—

Mr. KEARNEY. If the spectators find the testimony of this witness very amusing, may I suggest there are some movie houses near this courthouse; you might be better interested there.

Any further outbreaks and those who are causing them will be removed from the room. The police will be asked to remove them from the room.

Mr. GLADNICK. You see, I went to Spain with the idea of fighting fascism, and I here want to tell the committee that the Spanish people were fighting fascism but they were also getting stabbed in the back by the Communists behind the front.

But the Russians had the attitude that they are a certain elite; they are above everyone else, whereas American, young idealists would be out in the trenches, filthy, dirty and the Russians lived the life of Riley; and they said this is the way the Soviets—well, they won't call themselves bureaucrats, but this is the way the Soviet military man is supposed to carry himself. He's supposed to have a chauffeur; he's supposed to have an orderly; he's supposed to have servants—and there are certain snobbish standards they must maintain, and they said, "You, with your American ideas of equalitarianism, must drop them. You've got to learn to live as a Soviet man."

I couldn't stomach that. However, it was very pleasant while it lasted.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mr. Gladnick, the committee is most interested in those who may have fought—and as Americans who may have fought—in Spain whom you could identify as members of the Communist Party, known to you to be members of the Communist Party, and I would like at this time to hand you a list, a partial list, of names of Americans who fought in Spain and ask you if you would see if you can recognize any of those people as members of the Communist Party, known to you to be such.

Mr. KEARNEY. And no other names will be mentioned.

Mr. KUNZIG. And I specifically request that no other names be mentioned, sir.

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, there is David Amariglio.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell each name as you come to it?

Mr. GLADNICK. David Amarigio. I did not know him as a staff officer in Spain, but I knew him as one of the leaders of the Spanish Aid Committee in France.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you knew him—

Mr. GLADNICK. I also knew him as a Communist by the name of David Leeds—Dave Leeds.

Mr. CLARDY. You better spell that first name.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes. Will you spell the first name you mentioned, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. David Amarigio—A-m-a-r-i-g-i-o.

In fact, the fact of the matter is he represented himself as representing the American Embassy in France.

Mr. KUNZIG. May I ask you, as to any of these names you know, if you know anything of the present whereabouts of these persons, would you kindly tell us?

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. GLADNICK. I don't know—

Mr. KUNZIG. I realize this has been some time ago.

Mr. GLADNICK. I don't where this man is today.

Archie Brown—I knew him as a Young Communist League member in Los Angeles, Calif. He was active in the longshore organization in San Pedro.

Phil Bard was a cartoonist.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell the name, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. Phil Bard was a cartoonist for the Young Worker. He was in—he was in Innocents Abroad.

The reason I say this—he was the commissar in charge of the first unit that went to Spain. I don't know the man has ever been beyond New York, and the majority of the men in that group were seamen; and he used to tell us how to behave in Le Havre and how to behave in Paris, and most of us have been all over the world before that.

Phil Bard never went to the front. He developed—I don't know—political sickness, or some kind of sickness, and came home and became a big hero. He never saw action Spain.

George Chakin I knew. He was a member of the Young Communist League. In Spain he served in the—I knew him not in the International Brigade. He served in Compensino's Division, or the Division Compensino, the commander in chief whose name is Valeriano Gonzales—

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell that?

Mr. GLADNICK. Gen. Valeriano Gonzales.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell that, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. George Chakin—he—I think he was in charge of waterfronts.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell that, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. C-h-a-k-i-n.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, the other name—Gonzales.

Mr. GLADNICK. Valeriano Gonzales was known in Spain as Compesino. He was in command of this division, and George Chakin was his engineer in charge of water—

Mr. KEARNEY. Would you spell the name Gonzales?

Mr. GLADNICK. Gonzales—G-o-n-z-a-l-e-s—

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, the first name.

Mr. GLADNICK. Gen. Valeriano Gonzales, but commonly known as Compe—C-o-m-p-e.

Mr. KEARNEY. How would you spell the first name?

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell the first name, please?

I won't try to pronounce it.

Mr. GLADNICK. Valeriano—V-a-l-e-r-i-a-n-o—

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you.

Mr. GLADNICK. Valeriano Gonzales, and George Chakin was his—he was in charge of the waterworks. He was wounded at Velletri in the month of July 1937.

Robert Cohen—I knew a Robert Cohen from New York, who was also in the Servicio Informacion Militar, which is the secret service of the Spanish Army, but which was actually one of the few branches of the Spanish Army completely dominated by the Communists and the GPU.

Now, I don't know if this is the Robert Cohen.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew a Robert Cohen?

Mr. GLADNICK. A Robert Cohen.

You only want to know who are the present Communists—

Mr. KUNZIG. No; those you knew—

Mr. GLADNICK (continuing). Or at that time were?

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). At the time to be Communists.

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, Dave Drummond was a Communist at that time. I understand he is out of the Communist Party now.

Bill Ellis—he was a member of the Young Communist League before he went to Spain, and afterward, and he was—he was in Spain.

You see, many of these people I met there as Communists. I didn't know what their political affiliations were before coming to Spain, and after I came back I wasn't with the Communists.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. GLADNICK. So, I am only mentioning those.

Bill Gandall was a Communist before he went to Spain.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell that name?

Mr. GLADNICK. G-a-n-d-a-l-l.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you.

Mr. GLADNICK. And I knew he was after—after returning—an organizer for the Transport Workers' Union here in New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's make it—

Mr. GLADNICK. He was a former marine, too.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's make it clear again we are only interested in those that you knew to be Communists at that time.

Mr. GLADNICK. Bill Gandall was an ambulance driver—ambulance chaser—in Spain, and he came back and he was a party member before he went.

Now, Hunter—I knew a Hunter in Spain who was a Negro, and he was a commissar. He was a Communist Party member before going to Spain. I don't know whether he is still.

Louis Kupperman—now, I knew a Kupperman who was head of the party fraction in the original Lincoln Battalion. I don't know his name was Louis Kupperman, but I knew a Kupperman.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew him to be a Communist?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes; he was head of the party fraction within the battalion.

Walter Kolowski.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell that, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. Walter Kolowski—K-o-l-o-w-s-k-i—but the Kolowski I knew was from Buffalo. This says Detroit.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, let's get this straight, then. You knew a Kolowski from Buffalo?

Mr. GLADNICK. From Buffalo, who was a Communist.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who was a Communist?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. And who was in Spain with you?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right.

Mr. GLADNICK. Now, John Little was head of the New York district of the Young Communist League. I met him in Spain when he was—came to have a chat with Lisa Koltzova—

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell the last name, please?

Mr. GLADNICK. Koltzova—K-o-l-t-z-o-v-a—at the Majestic Hotel in Barcelona. She was the representative of the Young Komsomodskaya—that is the junior edition of Pravda in Russia—and he came to talk to her about youth problems, and I met him in Spain; but he was not a soldier in Spain. He was just a visiting fireman.

Bill Lawrence was the base commissar of the International Brigade for the Americans. He was a Communist, and he was a political commissar. He was never a soldier and never at the front.

Now, there's some people here who are dead, but—

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's not name them. We'll go right on.

Mr. GLADNICK. Now, Steve Nelson—I knew him in Spain as a commissar and, to the best of my knowledge, he's still a Communist to this day.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that the same Steve Nelson who was indicted in the State of Pennsylvania—

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing) some months ago—

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). And tried and convicted?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Louis Ornitz, on Bryant Avenue of the Bronx, was a Young Communist, but I take it for granted he was a Young Communist League member.

Robert Raven—

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell that last name?

Mr. GLADNICK. Bob Raven—was a member of the Young Communist League. He went with me to Spain. He was wounded in Spain, lost the sight of both his eyes. He was a Young Communist League member when he went. He went to Spain to commit suicide and, after he got wounded, it sort of changed his entire outlook on life. He became a man on a pedestal—most unusual character I ever met.

The man told me he came to Spain for one reason—he wanted to die because he was an unrecognized Greenwich Village artist. Today, I understand, he's some sort of a money collector for the Communist movement.

Yale Stuart I knew as Yale Skolnik. He was in Spain. The last I've heard of him he was an organizer for the Retail-Wholesale Workers' Union. He lost an arm in Spain.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you spell the names Stuart and Skolnik?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, his name—his party name was Yale Stuart. He was a lifeguard before going to Spain at Camp Unity up at Queensdale, N. Y., and he was a member of the Young Communist League when he went to Spain.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell—

Mr. GLADNIK. After that, I met him. He was an organizer in the 5-and-10 center—in the 5-and-10-cent stores for the Wholesale and Retail Workers' Union. This was in 1939.

Mr. DOYLE. Was Camp Unity—

Mr. CLARDY. How do you spell that name?

Mr. GLADNICK. His name is Skolnik. Skolnik is his real name.

Mr. CLARDY. Which way do you spell it?

Mr. GLADNICK. S-k-o-l-n-i-k.

Mr. CLARDY. How do you spell Stuart?

Stuart is spelled two ways.

Mr. GLADNICK. It's spelled in the Scotch manner—S-t-u-a-r-t—Royal House of Stuart.

Mr. DOYLE. Was Camp Unity a Communist-sponsored camp?

Mr. GLADNICK. Camp Unity, as far as I knew, was owned by the Communist Party. Buses used to leave 50 East 13th Street, or 35 East 12th Street. It is the same building, with a front and rear entrance.

By the way, I would like to make a point here. Under no circumstances should you confuse Camp Unity with Unity House, which is a very fine place, owned by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and is not in any way connected with the Communist Party.

Capt. Samuel Stember. I certainly know Stember. He was political commissar of the original Lincoln Battalion, and when we went into action he was conspicuous by his absence.

Lucia—Tony Santa Lucia. I knew him as Tony Sands. He was a waterfront Communist when he went to Spain. Today I don't know if he is a Communist.

Mr. CLARDY. That you had better spell.

Mr. GLADNICK. Oh, his name is Anthony Santa Lucia—L-u-c-i-a—and his party name on the waterfront was Tony Sands. He was a member of the longshoremen's fraction. He was a member of the waterfront Communist fraction when he went to Spain. Whether he is one today or not, I haven't got the slightest idea.

Anna Taft—a nurse—I think she's the sister—I'm not positive. I'm not—I mean I'm just wondering—

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, let's—

Mr. GLADNICK. I think she is—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Not testify to anything you are not positive of.

Mr. GLADNICK. All right. If it is in that family, then it is. It's many years ago.

That's the only people I could see on this list who I'm positive of being members of the Communist Party at the time they went to Spain.

Mr. KUNZIG. And whom you knew as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right—either in Spain, before or after.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I want to turn to something slightly different for a few moments.

You mentioned the Brooklyn Navy Yard earlier. Would you tell the committee in detail everything you know about a cell existing at the Brooklyn Navy Yard?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, as far as I know, there was a cell existing in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, of which I know 3 members—3 members of which are personally known to me.

Most of the people who went into the navy yard went via the CMTC, National Guard, building themselves a proper background and reputation and, on the basis of that, passing the civil-service exam and entering the navy yard.

Some of them took special courses at Baron D. Herb Mechanical Trade School in order to be qualified mechanics to get in.

The function of the cell was mostly that—the cell I knew was young Communists—was to organize an apprentice group within the navy yard, oh, like Communists in the other industrial setups, who would try to organize trade-union unity league unions.

This is back in 1931, 1932, and 1933, when Communists had their own unions.

Those in the Brooklyn Navy Yard never attempted to organize any of these open Communist organizations.

They organized first this apprentice group, which comprised—the only purpose was simple trade-union problems—and the purpose of that was to conceal their identity as Communists, so that later on when they finished their apprenticeship and became journeymen they would enter the regular metal trades' departments of the Brooklyn Navy Yard; and on the basis of their experience as leadership, and also being Young Communists, and getting outside advice, they soon grew in importance within the navy yard.

Mr. MOULDER. That was during the period of time, you say, from 1931—

Mr. GLADNICK. 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who did you know to be connected with this?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, Velson, or Shavey, I named—Shavey Wilson—was one, and—

Mr. KUNZIG. Irving Velson, or Shavey Wilson?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

And Dodo Malken.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, just a minute.

Mr. GLADNICK. And George Gorchoff.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell Dodo Malken?

Mr. GLADNICK. In the Young Communist League I knew him only by the name of Dodo.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now is that D-o-d-o?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. And is Malken M-a-l-k-e-n?

Mr. GLADNICK. M-a-l-k-i-n, or M-a-l-k-e-n. I am not sure of the name.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right; that is two, and who was the third?

Mr. GLADNICK. George Gorchoff.

Mr. KUNZIG. George Gorchoff?

Mr. GLADNICK. George Gorchoff.

Mr. KUNZIG. And George Gorchoff you mentioned earlier in your testimony today?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

However, I am of the opinion that the unit was much larger than that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, is there any further information that you have, or any further testimony that you can give, with regard to Velson?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, as I mentioned before, Shavey Velson was the head of the Young Communist League group that penetrated the Armed Forces. At a convention of the Young Communist League that I attended, Bronx Park-East Allerton section, where the Communists at that time had a cooperative house, Velson sat behind a curtain listening to the proceedings of the convention. At one part of the convention he called in all of the district organizers, and they discussed the question of penetration of the Armed Forces in the various districts—Minnesota, Chicago, California—penetration of the National Guard, CMTG, and other Armed Forces' establishments in that area, and he seemed to be the boss of the entire show.

Mr. KEARNEY. The committee will stand in recess for 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 2:27 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2:32 p. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 2:40 p. m., the following committee members being present: Representatives Bernard W. Kearney (presiding), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.).

Mr. KEARNEY. The committee will be in order.

Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, a few questions: You identified a man by the name of Springer who also, as you explained it, had the name of Saul when you knew him in New York. Now, I want to ask some questions about that for reasons which, of course, you fully understand, but I want to get it on the record; and I will preface it by asking you if this document I have is not a report and record of the 27th convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union?

Mr. GLADNICK. It is.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, I don't intend to read the several pages into the record, but there are two places marked here—pages 163 to 168 and 639 to 649. Suppose you tell us in your own words what that part of the record bears on and what it means.

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, it's a known fact the American labor movement has pretty well taken care of the Commies within its own ranks. The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union has a very proud record in this respect. However, in Los Angeles a small minority of Communists, working overtime, were able to control and confuse some of our members there and Joe Springer, whom we've mentioned here before, became the manager of the Los Angeles executive board.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, that was about what time?

Mr. GLADNICK. I don't know when he became manager, but he was up until 1950.

Mr. CLARDY. Go ahead.

Mr. GLADNICK. The international in 1947, at its convention in 1947, sent out a committee of the general executive board to take up the

question of Communist infiltration and Communist domination and fellow traveling within the Los Angeles organization, and this report is based upon the report of those officers who went there in 1948, 1949—their report to the convention in 1950.

Ours is a democratic organization, and the convention of all the members is the final body, and the final place of appeal.

The convention unanimously voted—when I say “unanimously,” I think there were three voted against—voted to rescind, suspend the officers of the Los Angeles organization and appoint—the convention ordered the general executive board to appoint people, representatives of the GEB, to take over the organization in Los Angeles.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, was Joe Springer one of those among the suspended officials?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. And the pages I have referred to in this document deal with the suspension and the actions that led up to that—

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And sort of a detailed history you have recited in brief?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, so there will be no mistake about it, I want to ask you again to be certain of your identification of Joe Springer as also Joe Saul.

At an executive session of this committee a photograph was exhibited to you. Do you recall that?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. You identified that, I believe, as being the man, Joe Springer, you knew?

Mr. GLADNICK. Joe Saul—Joe Springer.

Mr. CLARDY. There was no doubt and is now no doubt in your mind that the man who appeared before this committee in Los Angeles, whose picture was exhibited to you, was the Joe Springer or the Joe Saul, whichever name we care to use?

Mr. GLADNICK. There is no doubt the picture you showed me is the man.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I have in mind.

That picture, by the way, was a newspaper picture taken at the time of the appearance of the gentleman on the stand at Los Angeles, as we told you.

Now, that leads to something more before I ask the next question. At the Los Angeles hearing—and I think we explained this to you—Mr. Springer was identified as the gentleman who had organized and conducted a Communist school at Crestline, Calif., in December of last year, a school where not the neophytes but the hardened Communists were brought in to be taught the sabotage methods and other things you have discussed thus far today.

Now, at that hearing at which it was disclosed there had been this Communist school conducted at a camp up in the mountains near Los Angeles, Mr. Springer was asked by Mr. Scherer whether he had ever used any name other than Springer.

I am right about that, am I not, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. And he denied it.

That is clearly and flatly in the record that he was never known by any other name than by Springer.

So, again I want to ask you this: Is there at this time any doubt in your mind about the dual identity?

Mr. GLADNICK. No; it is the same man.

Mr. FRAZIER. Show him the picture.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we can show him the picture.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Now, we have here again the picture, which has been exhibited to you once.

Mr. SCHERER. This is, I think, a different picture.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, it is the same gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. The same gentleman.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you identify what paper and what date?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes. This is, Mr. Clardy, the Los Angeles Times of Thursday morning, March 26, and it carries a headline, "Secret Red Revolution School Near L. A. Bared."

Mr. CLARDY. That is 1953?

Mr. SCHERER. 1953—2 months ago; and there is a picture of Joe Springer on the front page, and, for the purpose of the record, maybe we can ask the witness to again look at that picture on the newspaper to which I have just referred.

I will ask you whether that is the man you knew both as Joseph Springer and as Joseph Saul.

Mr. GLADNICK. Joe Saul.

Mr. SCHERER. Joe.

Mr. GLADNICK. Not Joseph Saul, but—

Mr. SCHERER. Joe Saul?

Mr. GLADNICK. Joe Saul.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that the man?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's the same man.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we can offer that in evidence, can't we, Mr. Counsel, as part of the record?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. It will be received.

(The newspaper article from the March 26, 1953, issue of the Los Angeles Times was received in evidence as Gladnick Exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. CLARDY. Now, Mr. Gladnick, I think you have testified in the executive sessions that you visited with Mr. Springer or Mr. Saul at Los Angeles?

Mr. GLADNICK. I did, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. When was that?

Mr. GLADNICK. To the best of my recollection, the months of January, February, and March of 1934.

Mr. CLARDY. And at that time was the Joe Springer or Joe Saul you met the same gentleman whose picture has been—

Mr. GLADNICK. Absolutely.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Exhibited to you?

Mr. GLADNICK. The same man.

Mr. CLARDY. Is he engaged out there in the same activity that he was engaged in for a livelihood back here in New York?

Mr. GLADNICK. In 1934 he was a cloakmaker in a shop.

Mr. CLARDY. He identified himself substantially as that in the record for us in California.

Again, I come back to the question: Having visited the man, is there the slightest possibility of an error by way of identification?

Mr. GLADNICK. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to read this in the record, but I think there should be some extracts put into the record after the witness has had a chance to show what should be made part of the record here to carry out the story fully in the record.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Beale reminds me that the exhibit I offered should be marked as "Gladnick Exhibit No. 1," and then presumably yours is Gladnick exhibit No. 2.

Mr. CLARDY. May that be done?

Mr. KEARNEY. That will be done.

(The excerpts referred to of the record and report of the 27th annual convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union were received in evidence as Gladnick exhibit No. 2.)

EXCERPT FROM PAGES 163 TO 168 OF THE REPORT AND RECORD OF THE 27TH
CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION

CHARGES AGAINST L. A. OFFICERS

Los Angeles has occupied the attention of the GEB at practically each of its sessions during the past several years. There were, of course, industrial matters which required consideration such as the above referred to general strike in 1948 in the sportswear industry and also the recurring efforts to organize the miscellaneous trades of that city.

However, it was the internal situation in the cloak joint board and to some extent in the dress joint board that has developed as a subject of major and constant irritation inasmuch as it affected basic ILGWU policy. Charges against officers of the Los Angeles cloak and dress joint boards of "failure to adhere to ILGWU policies and principles" have been continually reaching the general office of the union from individual members and from groups of Los Angeles members. These charges have, on several occasions, been also drawn to the attention of the GEB by the director of the Pacific coast region of the ILGWU, Vice President Louis Levy.

These charges contained complaints that the Los Angeles cloak and dress joint boards and their component locals have been utilizing their offices and the union's prestige in behalf of varied Communist causes and "united front" movements, and that these officers have caused anguish and embarrassment to loyal ILGWU members by their action at Los Angeles Central Labor Council meetings where, instead of representing the policies of the ILGWU, our delegates actually represented and advocated the policies of the Communist Party.

The situation with regard to these violations became even more acute when, in the course of organizational work, the union was prevented from obtaining certification from the NLRB because some of the accused officers who took an oath of allegiance to the ILGWU, had violated that oath by following the instructions of the Communist Party not to sign the anti-Communist affidavits and had thereby deprived the members of union-shop status.

Still other charges recited complaints that these officers have consistently given known Communists job preference in the shops and that shop chairmen who were not party followers have been systematically replaced by Communist sympathizers. A veritable reign of terror has all but silenced opposition from non-Communist members in the Los Angeles cloak and dress shops, it was reported.

Action to correct this situation became imperative, and the GEB at its fourth quarterly meeting in Miami Beach in December 1948 appointed a committee of three vice presidents, Luigi Antonini, Isidore Nagler, and Joseph Breslaw, to proceed at an early date to Los Angeles, to investigate the matter in full, and to take whatever steps they might find necessary to rectify it.

GEB COMMITTEE INVESTIGATES

This special committee early in March 1949 went to Los Angeles, and after hearings which lasted 5 days presented its findings, in the form of official decisions, to both the cloak and dress joint boards.

The special committee's decisions, however, while based on findings which proved the guilt of those Los Angeles officers who were charged with violations of ILGWU laws and rules, nevertheless were not of a final nature but rather of a probationary character. They amounted to suspended sentences issued in the hope that the transgressors would take these admonitions to heart and would mend their ways.

Reproduced below are some of the pertinent excerpts of the findings of the GEB special committee on the situation in Los Angeles dated March 20, 1949:

Findings and decisions of the special committee of the general executive board

The special committee consisting of First Vice President Luigi Antonini and Vice Presidents Isidore Nagler and Joseph Breslaw, designated by the general executive board to investigate a number of matters which have been brought to its attention regarding the union in the city of Los Angeles, such as charges filed by a number of members of the union against the officers of the cloak joint board and its component local unions; to make inquiry and ascertain the facts in regard to a petition for the establishment and chartering of a separate local union of cloak operators within the cloak joint board; and to investigate in general the administrative affairs of the cloak joint board and its component local unions, has held hearings upon these matters for 5 days.

"The special committee was vested with full power and authority by the general executive board to make such determinations and to take such appropriate action as in its opinion is warranted, based upon the facts, circumstances, and conditions disclosed after proper hearing and investigation.

"The special committee has made every effort to get all the facts in order to enable it to make a proper determination.

"The hearings held by the special committee, as both parties have stated before the special committee, were conducted in a fair and impartial manner and in accordance with the constitution of our international in the highest ethics of the progressive trade-union movement.

"We regretfully state that the facts disclosed by the hearing warrant the taking of immediate corrective measures if the good name, traditions, and policies of our international are to be preserved. The hearings disclosed the fact that the cloak joint board and its component local unions have on different occasions adhered to and pursued policies and procedures inimicable to the best interest of our international union. In the opinion of the special committee, these policies and procedures were pursued only because of the pressure of an insignificant group of Communist leaders who have infiltrated the joint board and its component local unions.

"Some of these action were as follows:

"(a) Supporting directly or indirectly Communist-front organizations.

"(b) Contributing funds to a number of such organizations.

"(c) Sending representatives or delegates to the central labor council and the State federation of labor who are well-known Communists and/or followers of the Communist Party line.

"(d) Introducing before the central labor council and the State federation of labor resolutions, and supporting before these bodies other resolutions, directly contrary to the policies and interest of our international union, thus creating the impression in the labor movement and the community generally that the cloak joint board and its component locals are Communist-dominated unions. These facts are borne out by the testimony at the hearing of Brothers Thomas Ranford, president of the Los Angeles Central Labor Council, and W. J. Bassett, secretary of the Los Angeles Central Labor Council.

"(e) Supporting organizations which exist as dual organizations to legitimate organizations sponsored generally by the American Federation of Labor and our international union.

"(f) Condoning the usage of the name of the cloak joint board by officers who lent their names to Communist-front or Communist Party organizations and literature.

"The committee is at this moment not desirous of disposing of the charges before it, although the evidence adduced at the hearings might warrant a more drastic solution, but rather attempts to correct certain situations, the correction of which, if carried out in accordance with the direction of this special committee, may obviate the necessity of further action on the charges.

"The committee hereby directs that the cloak joint board and its component locals be placed under the supervision of the international union and the general office for such a period of time as the general executive board may deem it advisable.

"In addition to general supervision, the supervisor is directed to act on the following matters:

(a) To fully investigate the present method of unemployment registration and job assignments within the local unions comprising the joint board, and to see to it that a policy of strict equality is maintained in the distribution of jobs.

(b) To assure that the delegates sent to the central labor council and the State federation of labor are of such caliber as will truly represent the policies and principles of our international union.

(c) To assure that the cloak joint board will not make contributions to any organization that is inimicable to the policies and principles of our international union.

"The committee is of the hope that its decisions will lead the way toward the creation of a harmonious and loyal relationship between the cloak joint board and the international, to the end that the great membership of the Los Angeles cloak joint board will benefit by such relationship."

A FEW CORRECTIVE STEPS

The GEB committee, after having submitted its findings and decisions to the two Los Angeles joint boards and prior to its departure for New York, accepted the resignations of two of the cloak joint board business agents, Charles Gladstone and Morris Isaacman, and declared vacant the office of a special organizer of cutters local 84 held by Jack Haas. The committee also removed from office Sara Dörner as chairman of the dress joint board, Abe Kendzer, vice chairman of local 96, and Claire Harford, organizer of the dress joint board, an active Communist. All these officers were charged, among other things, with refusing to sign the non-Communist affidavits.

The GEB committee further announced the appointment of Morris Bagno, for several years assistant director of the cloak out-of-town department in the East, as general supervisor of the Los Angeles cloak joint board. Supervisor Bagno, among other duties, was assigned to institute a policy of strict equality in the distribution of jobs; to make sure delegates to central bodies from the joint board and its locals would represent the interests of the union and the accepted policies of the ILGWU, and that the cutters local 84 establish complete cooperation with the sportswear joint council.

A similar series of measures was contained in the GEB committee's decision affecting the dress joint board. All officers were ordered to sign non-Communist affidavits, and the board and its locals were instructed not to make any contributions to any organization that is inimical to the policies and principles of the ILGWU. Margaret Di Maggio, veteran organizer in the dress industry in the East and for many years in the service of local 89, was appointed general organizer for the dress joint board and international representative.

DIRECTIVES STILL EVADED

Nevertheless, the following 8 months have proved that the anticipation of the special GEB committee for a forthright acceptance of its decisions by the Los Angeles officials have not materialized. While the situation in the dress joint board did improve considerably, the leadership of the cloak joint board has continued to sabotage the policies of the international, obstructed the work of Supervisor Bagno and continued to embarrass the ILGWU by sending disloyal delegates to the Los Angeles central body in defiance of the GEB. The international was compelled to issue frequent directives to these Los Angeles officers, while the confusion in the ranks of our members kept growing and the stability of the organization was being jeopardized. This state of affairs was affecting the union's position in its dealings with the employers and hampered it from exercising a constructive influence on the industry.

It is for these reasons that the GEB, after hearing reports from President Dubinsky, from Vice President Louis Stulberg, who visited Los Angeles upon the president's instructions, and of Supervisor Morris Bagno, decided to defer local elections for officers and executive boards of the Los Angeles cloak and dress joint boards and their component local unions, and to call upon the convention to deal with this matter and to promulgate a firm policy. The decision by the GEB, adopted on January 19, 1950, in the form of a resolution, reads as follows:

GEB recounts case

"Whereas charges of serious and grave misconduct in violation of the constitution of the ILGWU, were duly filed with the GEB by 27 members of the ILGWU, against the Los Angeles cloak joint board, the Los Angeles dress joint board,

their component local unions, and all their officers and all the members of their executive boards; and

"Whereas the GEB appointed a special committee to investigate such charges and other matters in connection with the administration of the joint boards and local unions, and the special committee held hearings in the city of Los Angeles, for 5 days in March 1949; and

"Whereas the special committee recommended certain action on the basis of its interim and partial report to the GEB, in which it stated that both joint boards and their component local unions 'have on different occasions adhered to and pursued policies and procedures inimicable to the best interests of our international union. In the opinion of the special committee these policies and procedures were pursued only because of the pressure of an insignificant group of Communist leaders who have infiltrated the joint board and its component local unions.'

"However the special committee further stated that 'The committee is at this moment not desirous of disposing of the charges before it, although the evidence adduced at the hearings might warrant a more drastic solution, but rather attempts to correct certain situations, the correction of which, if carried out in accordance with the direction of the special committee, may obviate the necessity of further action on the charges'; and

"Whereas on June 9, 1949, the GEB unanimously approved and accepted the report of the special committee as an interim and partial report; and

Effects on union morale

"Whereas events since the approval of such report and the directives of the special committee have demonstrated that the hopes of the special committee have not materialized; and that the situations concerning which it reported have not been corrected, thereby undermining the stability of the Los Angeles organization, and reflecting adversely upon the morale and prestige of the membership and the Los Angeles organization, as well as upon the entire membership of the ILGWU and its standing in the garment industry and in the labor movement in general; and

"Whereas upon the petition of Los Angeles members of the ILGWU, the GEB has chartered two separate new local unions of operators and finishers in place of the former local 65, and such new local unions are about to elect their first officers and executive board members; and

"Whereas the charges and subsequent events affect both the cloak joint board and the dress joint board in Los Angeles, and their component local union of cutters (84) and the local union of pressers (97) are affiliated with both joint boards, and affect, and are affected by, the actions of both joint boards; and

Convention final judge

"Whereas any previous decisions, orders, and directives of the GEB, relative to this situation, and any which the GEB might now make, will be subject to the approval of the forthcoming convention of the ILGWU, the supreme governing body of the union; and

"Whereas the GEB is of the opinion that the report of the special committee of the GEB, and all decisions, orders, and directives of the GEB pertaining to the Los Angeles situation, as well as the contentions of the present decided by the forthcoming convention, scheduled to commence on May 23, administrations of the cloak and dress joint boards should be considered in 1950; and

"Whereas since the convention will have to establish policy and procedure to be followed pertaining to this situation, the GEB decides that no further corrective measures should be taken at this meeting, but the entire matter should be referred to the convention as a special order of business so that the convention may lay down policy and procedure for the guidance of the membership and the administrations of our organizations in Los Angeles.

The GEB further decides

"1. Delegates and alternate delegates to the 27th convention of the ILGWU shall be elected in accordance with the provisions of the ILGWU constitution.

"2. Elections of officers and executive board members of the Los Angeles cloak and dress joint boards and their component local unions shall be deferred until such elections can be held pursuant to the decision of the convention, so that the administrations then elected shall be in accordance with the mandate and policies and decisions determined by the convention; and any steps already taken by the dress and cloak joint boards and their component local unions preparatory to holding such elections now shall be held in abeyance.

"3. The term of office of each present officer, and the tenure of position of each executive board member, of the Los Angeles cloak joint board and Los Angeles dress joint board, and each of their component local unions, shall continue until their successors have been determined under whatever decision is rendered by the 27th convention of the ILGWU.

"4. General supervisor Morris Bagno and General Organizer Margaret Di Maggio shall continue to function under the previous directives of the GEB until otherwise directed by the GEB or the convention.

"5. The president of the ILGWU is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to bring this decision to the attention of the joint boards and local unions affected, and to take whatever steps may be necessary to effectuate this."

UP TO CONVENTION NOW

As this situation has developed during the past few years and up until today, the Los Angeles cloak joint board and its component locals are the only sector within our international union where we are faced with irritating and unstable internal conditions. The GEB has displayed long and unrewarding patience in the Los Angeles situation: throughout this period it did not wish to resort to a procedure of deposing the guilty officers or to reorganize the union in question or to adopt other stringent steps although the situation warranted it and although many demands from members to that effect had poured into the general office.

We abstained from drastic measures in the hope that this situation, grave though it is, would eventually resolve itself. The situation has not and, quite apparently, will not resolve of itself. Corrective measures have become essential. We are calling this situation, therefore, to the attention of this convention with the recommendation that the convention adopt corrective steps that would make our Los Angeles organization an integral part of the ILGWU, to serve the interests of the members and the union and not a political group.

* * * * *

EXCERPT FROM PAGES 639 TO 649 OF THE REPORT AND RECORD OF THE 27TH CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS UNION

President DUBINSKY. I will ask the committee on officers report to submit that part of the report which deals with the Los Angeles situation which has been referred by the general executive board to this convention.

The chairman of the committee will proceed with his report.

LOS ANGELES SITUATION

Delegate SHANE. The report of the general executive board devotes considerable space to the international situation in the cloak joint board and in the dress joint board of Los Angeles. The delegates will find that 6 pages of the report beginning with page 163 and concluding with page 168, are devoted to the Los Angeles internal struggle. In connection therewith, our committee is called upon to deal with resolution No. 35, introduced by local 97, expressing thanks to the general executive board for taking the action it did in connection with Los Angeles.

Your committee carefully examined the report of the general executive board. We also examined the minutes of the hearings before the special committee consisting of First Vice President Luigi Antonini and Vice Presidents Isidore Nagler and Joseph Breslaw, designated by the general executive board to investigate the situation in Los Angeles. At our request the delegates of the cloak and dress joint boards and of locals 55 and 58 (formerly 65), 84, 96, and 97, appeared before us and presented their views. We also received a written statement from the representative of the cloak joint board in support of its position and a written statement from local 84 denying the charges its membership has either subscribed to the policies of the Communist Party or that it has failed to cooperate 100 percent with the policies of the international. We also received the views of Vice President Louis Levy, Abe Levy, and Morris Bagno, who was designated general supervisor for the cloak joint board, and Margaret di Maggio, who was designated international representative and general organizer for the dress joint board.

The attention of the delegates is drawn to the fact that the irritating internal situation in Los Angeles has existed for several years. We do not know of any specific local internal situation which has occupied so much attention and has taken so much time and energy of the general executive board as this Los Angeles

situation. The very fact that the board found it necessary to send a special committee of three vice presidents to investigate the situation on the spot and to take testimony of the various factions involved and the very fact that thereafter, in accordance with the recommendations of that special committee the board found it necessary to designate a supervisor for the cloak joint board and a special representative as general organizer for the dress joint board, indicates how aggravated the internal situation in Los Angeles is. In the opinion of your committee, the findings and decision of the special committee of the general executive board was fully warranted and we concur with the action taken by the GEB on that report. It is to be noted that the special committee of the GEB was far from convinced that the recommendations made by it would be sufficient to solve the Los Angeles problem. It expressed a hope that "its decision will lead the way toward the creation of a harmonious and loyal relationship among all concerned." Your committee regrets to say that the hopes of the special committee of the GEB did not materialize.

One of the questions which concerned your committee was to what extent have the directives given by the international to the Los Angeles representatives been carried out in good faith.

The position of the manager of the cloak joint board at our hearings, in substance, was that it has complied with the recommendations and decisions of the general executive board. He did not deny that prior thereto, contributions were made by the cloak joint board to causes and organizations opposed to the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; that the representatives of the joint board at the Central Labor Council and State Federation [Labor] of California had and supported the views contrary to the official position of the international. He also admitted that for a period of almost 2 years the cloak joint board could not make use of the machinery of the National Labor Relations Board because two of its business agents refused to sign the non-Communist affidavits required under the law. However, he claimed that they remained on the payroll because Vice President Levy advised him that no elections should take place until specific orders to that effect would be given by the GEB. Vice President Levy gave us an entirely different version of this incident.

Wholly aside from the issue of whether or not the joint boards and their component locals have conducted themselves in a spirit becoming organizations of our international, and of whether or not they complied in good faith with the decisions made by the general executive board based upon the recommendations of its special committee, we deplore the fact that the membership of the joint boards were driven into factions, a faction in support of the policies of the ILGWU and a faction in opposition to the representatives of the ILGWU. This split is carried over into the shops and into the street with the result that the union is split and the influence of the union and of the international is continuously being undermined. If this situation is permitted to continue much longer, the division in the ranks will become wider and deeper, will affect the interest not only of the members of the cloak industry but of the international in the entire Los Angeles area.

In the opinion of your committee the very fact that the Coat and Suit Manufacturers' Association in Los Angeles, which has been in existence for 35 years, has chosen this particular moment to take steps for dissolution in an effort to evade its responsibilities under the collective labor agreement, could be traced directly to the split in the cloak joint board.

We do not mean to imply that this is the only cause which prompted the association to take this step. Undoubtedly, there are industrial problems with which it is confronted which will require a solution in which the union will have to participate. The association, however, sought to take advantage of the internal union situation. It is only the determined stand taken by President Dubinsky which has compelled the association to at least temporarily continue with their labor relations as provided in the collective agreement. We dealt with that situation elsewhere in that report. We refer to it again at this time only to emphasize the consequences that may follow from the policy of the present leadership of the cloak joint board and its effect on the wages and earnings of the workers in this industry. This situation cannot and must not be tolerated.

Your committee is convinced that the guiding spirits of the present administrations of the locals and of the joint boards have been under the influence, if not the actual domination, of members of the Communist Party, which is inimical to the spirit and practices of our international. We are further convinced that by removing from office those who declined to sign the non-Communist

affidavit, the dominant influences in these administrations have not been completely eradicated. We are also convinced that the recommendations of the special committee of the GEB were not lived up to in good faith. The alleged attempts at compliance were merely superficial, at best technical; they were not genuine; they were lacking a real desire to comply with the spirit which prompted these recommendations. The promises and protestations of loyalty have been made with mental reservations.

We are of the opinion that the charge of communism insofar as the membership of the cloak and of the dress joint boards is concerned has been grossly exaggerated. We are convinced that the greatest majority of our members and even of the administrations of the locals coming under these joint boards are neither Communists, fellow travelers, nor even members following the line of the Communist Party. We are, however, convinced that the Communist followers in the locals and in the joint boards have so dominated these administrations that by various means they succeeded in having a majority in these administrations follow their wills and policies imposed by them. The natural inclination of people to find themselves with the majority prompted some of the minority, including local 84, to follow the guiding influence of this controlled majority. This may explain the actions of the representatives of local 84 in their own local as well as in the joint board.

As long as these influences will remain in power, there will be no internal peace in the Los Angeles joint boards. If these factors are permitted to continue, the strength and influence of the joint boards in Los Angeles will deteriorate industrially, the membership will suffer the consequences, and the prestige of the international will be greatly undermined. Those who have been under the influence of the Communist followers will seek to widen their influence and secure more adherence to their faction at the expense of and to the detriment of the international. The recommendations of the special committee of the GEB did not prove to be sufficient to permeate the joint boards with the spirit of loyalty to the international which is prevalent in the other locals. The Los Angeles unions are still divided. The supervisor designated by the GEB for the cloak joint board is pointed at as if he were an outsider, a policeman with a club over their heads. His presence in Los Angeles is used by the anti-international forces for agitation to antagonize the union members against the international. The joint boards, especially that of the cloak, conduct themselves as if there were two policies in our international. Only one policy can and must prevail and that is the public policy enunciated by the international.

Your committee is not unmindful that since the report of the special committee of the GEB has been made, there were considerable changes in the attitude of all of the locals and the joint boards to the international, especially in locals 84, 96, and in the dress joint board. We are also not unmindful that some of the locals, especially locals 97 and even 84, have at all times had a very wholesome respect for all directives and orders issued by the general office of our international. However, since all of them have been a part of the joint boards which warrant the measures hereinafter recommended by us, we believe that these measures should apply to any and all locals comprising the joint boards in the cloak and dress industries, as well as the joint boards themselves.

We therefore recommend:

1. In view of the fact that the term of the present administrations in the cloak and dress joint boards and their component locals had already expired, and that the present executive boards and officers are merely holdovers, and that no elections, pursuant to previous directives, have as yet been held in the newly established locals 55 and 58 (formerly local 65), the incoming GEB is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to declare the terms of office of all the administrations of the joint boards and all their component locals as ended. The exact date or dates on which these terms shall be ended is left to the sole discretion of the incoming GEB. The term "administrations" shall include not only the paid and nonpaid officers but also the executive boards and any and all delegates and committees designated or appointed by the respective executive boards.

2. Pending the setting of a date for elections as referred to hereafter, the incoming GEB is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to designate provisional administrations for any and all of said locals and joint boards as it may deem advisable.

3. The incoming general executive board is authorized, empowered, and directed to set a date or dates for elections of administrations in the respective locals and the joint boards as soon as possible. The exact date or dates is left to the

sole discretion of the GEB. However, in those locals or joint boards for which provisional administrations have been designated by the GEB, no elections shall be held until an opportunity is extended to the provisional administrations to get thoroughly acquainted with the situation and report to the GEB its recommendations.

4. Any and all members of the administrations of both the cloak and dress joint boards and of all their component locals, as well as all those members who have aided and abetted in instigating the union members against the official policies of the international, shall be ineligible to hold office or be candidates for office for the ensuing term.

The incoming GEB is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to pass upon the eligibility of any member to be a candidate or hold office during the ensuing term in any of the administrations of the joint boards and their component locals. The decision of the GEB or of any representative designated by it for the purpose of passing upon the eligibility of candidates for any office, shall be final.

5. The powers granted herein by this convention to the incoming GEB may be delegated by it to a special committee or to any representative or representatives it may designate under such supervision and direction as it may deem advisable.

6. The incoming GEB is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed, with its sole discretion, to suspend either or both joint boards and any or all of their component locals, to revoke the charters of either or both joint boards and of any or of all of their component locals, and to reorganize either or both joint boards and any or all of their component locals.

The incoming GEB is also authorized, empowered, and directed to implement the power given to it by this convention in any manner that it may deem fit for the purpose of effectuating the main objective of this decision.

7. The powers granted by this convention to the incoming GEB to deal with the present internal situation in both the cloak and dress joint boards and their component locals in Los Angeles, shall not be deemed to be restricted by any of the provisions in the constitution of our international.

The welfare of the membership of Los Angeles and the interest of our international warrants that these broad powers shall be granted to the incoming GEB. We sincerely hope that there will be no need for the board to exercise all these powers.

Delegate SHANE. Mr. President, I move the adoption of this part of the report. [Applause.]

President DUBINSKY. You heard the report and the recommendation of the committee.

Delegate JOSEPH SPRINGER. In the report as submitted by the committee on officers report, various statements have been made in regard to the Los Angeles situation. I would like to say a few words on particularly this matter because certain things have been brought out here, as far as the testimony is concerned, in the matter of noncomplying with the decision of the general executive board that was out a year ago in the city of Los Angeles, and also in the matter where it deals with the two business agents that did not sign the non-Communist Taft-Hartley affidavits, and what were the reasons for holding them in office.

On the question of why they were held in office during that period of time, as the committee states, we presented our statement to the committee. However, the committee further states that Vice President Levy's statements were to the contrary. We called it to the attention of the committee. However, I wish to call it to the attention of this convention that sometime early in February 1948, we had a general strike in Los Angeles. However, not only did the cloak joint board retain them on the orders of Vice President Levy, but Levy himself, at that particular time, took 1 of those 2 business agents, namely Glasgow, and put him in a leading position in the strike. If the joint board did anything wrong in the matter of retaining those 2 business agents for 16 months or thereabout, how is it then the committee states that the joint board did not live up to the decision of the general executive board when one of the members of the general executive board told us not to dispense with their services and he himself put him into office?

Now, then, another problem that the committee deals with is the problem of the Cloak Manufacturers Association, and I believe that it is nothing new to the members of this convention because in the officers report appears a letter, or rather a transcript of a letter, which was sent to the president of the Los Angeles association, to a gentleman by the name of Mr. Silbert. Now I want to state

this, that not only is the question of the dissension in Los Angeles not caused because we cannot agree on settlement of prices or economic conditions, but it is something else, and I will talk on this particular problem in a minute. But the association is claiming that our Los Angeles people are way out of line in the question of earnings, of wages, and we know in Los Angeles they are incorrect. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is a Federal fact-finding agency and let me quote you—in the last computations that I was able to obtain as of January 1950, we find, for example, that operators are getting \$3.29 an hour. This is what the association is claiming, and this is what we disagree with. Therefore, let us not state, as the committee states it, because there are some differences in the city of Los Angeles, that that is the reason why the association is taking advantage of our organization at the present time.

Now, then, on the question of differences of opinion, let us examine and let us see what has caused it particularly after the committee consisting of Vice Presidents Antonini, Breslaw, and Nagler were out there. Did the joint board try to cooperate as laid down by these three vice presidents? We certainly did. The joint board as such tried to comply within the framework of the decision of the three vice presidents. However, when Supervisor Bagno came out there, a group was organized under Brother Bagno's supervision. This is not living up to the spirit of the three vice presidents of the general executive board who came out to Los Angeles. This tended to divide the membership and, therefore, let us read the letter the way it should be read and let us not read it one sided.

Delegate ABE F. LEVY (local 496). I am affiliated with the joint council. I think it is fitting that the loyal unions in Los Angeles arise at this time to say a few words. You, delegates, who are sitting here are probably hearing about the Los Angeles situation for the first time. We have been living with it for 5 years or 6. We have been living in the Berlin of our international. The city has been half loyal and half disloyal. I do not know whether you people realize what it means to live in a city where the members of your own union are constantly sticking the knife of betrayal in your back. I wish I had the permission of the convention to give you a few examples of what the Communists did not only to the cloakmakers and to the dressmakers, but what they did to the loyal sportswear workers in the city of Los Angeles as well.

What does it mean to be a member of the international in this Berlin? It means that you are a member of a union which is branded in the public press, in the halls of organized labor and throughout the community as a Communist-front union. It means picking up the newspapers and seeing full-page advertisements inserted by nonunion and antiunion manufacturers, stating in bold print that the ILGWU is a Communist union because its officers have refused to sign the non-Communist affidavit required by law. It means that Communist-front organizations put out publications and leaflets on which appear the names of the Los Angeles cloak and dress boards and those of the responsible officers of those unions.

It means that financial support is contributed in substantial sums to Communist-front organizations by your own union. It means going to the State convention of the American Federation of Labor and having a delegate from local 65 refused his seat at that convention because he is found by the committee on credentials to be a member of the Communist Party.

We have to sit there and take that upon our shoulders. In the political field it means that while you work for the candidates and for the policies that are endorsed by the recognized labor movement, that these betrayers of labor hold their own candidates and make their own holidays and the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union is charged with that responsibility.

I say to you, a lot of you know and a lot of you don't know, that the Communist policy today is as it was in 1926 to 1929: If you cannot control the international, destroy it. In 1947 they sneaked up to our election to the sportswear joint council and brazenly conducted a campaign to dislodge the loyal elements and gain complete control over the entire union in Los Angeles.

It is to the credit of the sportswear workers that they had the good sense and loyalty to throw this challenge back into the teeth of the Communists and the fact that the joint council is today a beachhead of loyalty to the international because they failed in their attempt to capture complete control of the union.

I say to you, and I am not the only one, I hope, who will say this to you, because there are other delegates, not from Los Angeles, who were in Los Angeles during the strike of 1948, and they will agree with me when I say that when we called a general strike for the purpose of organizing the balance of the dress

and sportswear market, that the Communists sabotaged that strike. I say to you that when Brother Bagno came to Los Angeles, after he was appointed by the general executive board to go out there and see what he could do to bring peace and harmony, he made an organization drive, and the Communists attempted to appoint over his head three organizers, and when those organizers were put aside by the general executive board and by Brother Bagno, the Communists raised a howl that he has sabotaged the organization of the joint cloak board.

Oh, yes, the People's World which is a west coast equivalent to the Daily Worker, prints statements to the effect that the international is permitting the open shop to spread, that the cloakmakers are suffering because of the spread of the open shop, while their comrades in the union sit on their hands and sabotage; they would destroy the union if they cannot control it.

I want to cite an instance to you which more than anything else crystalizes what it means to be a loyal member of the international. You heard how the officers of the joint board refused to execute the non-Communist affidavits. You heard that they remained in office for 2 years after that. What you did not hear was this: Local 84, the cutter's union, is not only a cloak or a dress but a sportswear local. Local 84 is part and parcel of the sportswear contract.

In 1948, when we executed a new contract in the sportswear industry, we went to the National Labor Relations Board and we said, "Gentlemen, conduct the union-shop election for us. We want to keep our contract, we want to keep our security."

The National Labor Relations Board said to us, "We are sorry; local 266 has disqualified; the joint council has qualified, but local 84 is not qualified, because it is part of a union which has not signed the affidavits; therefore, since this is one whole unit for the purpose of collective bargaining, we cannot grant you an election."

What happened was that this year the open shoppers filed a complaint against the sportswear union before the National Labor Relations Board, charging we had violated the act by failing to conduct a union-shop election. Our contract is in jeopardy. The NLRB has threatened to invalidate it, to remove us as a collective-bargaining agency, and we may have to go through a general strike to preserve our working conditions—all because the disloyal business agents and their associates refused to sign the non-Communist affidavits.

What happened after they refused to sign those non-Communist affidavits? Springer stood up here and beat his breast saying they are not responsible; they had orders from Vice President Levy and President Dubinsky not to replace these people and not hold an election. What he failed to tell you was, it was his duty as a manager of a joint board to remove those two business agents, regardless of what occurred. [Applause.]

Appointment was offered to them. No; they wouldn't take appointment; they were looking for political issues with which to fight the international. I had quite a bit more to say, but I think what I said convinces you of what it means to be loyal to the international in Los Angeles. I appeal to the delegates of this convention to adopt the report of the committee, to free Los Angeles, to bring all of the members within the fold of our great and glorious international union once again.

President DUBINSKY. First Vice President Antonini, who was a member of the committee, wants to say a few words. [Applause.]

First Vice President ANTONINI. In listening to Brother Springer I had to smile, because I was the chairman of the special committee of the general executive board sent to Los Angeles to remedy that situation. There is an old saying in Italian which, translated, means, "If the dragon is softhearted, gangrene may set in the wound."

We had a strong committee, and after we had talked to the people in Los Angeles we said, "It is up to you to remedy the situation." We hoped that at the jubilee convention of our international the Los Angeles union would come to us as part and parcel of our great international. We regret that this has not come to pass.

In reading the last recommendation of the report, it says, "We sincerely hope that there will be no need for the board to exercise all those powers." It ended with exactly the same words of your special committee report in Los Angeles. I think that this is a time for real surgery. The committee gave the proper decision. If we are concerned about other unions trying to erase the blot of Stalinists, well, let's start to clean our own house. [Applause.]

Brother President, I rise to support 100 percent the recommendation of the committee on officers' report. [Applause.]

President DUBINSKY. Delegate Jackson, of local 60, promised me he would speak only 1 or 2 minutes.

Delegate ALLAN JACKSON (local 60). Brother President, fellow delegates, I do know the international is a united organization, and we must not allow the seeds of dissension to divide us. [Applause.] We know at once our adversary, the Communists. We do not want them in our schools, and we surely do not want them in our international union, the ladies' garment workers. [Applause.]

I think we all recommended that our delegates adopt the report as read from the platform. [Applause.]

President DUBINSKY. I told you this morning that I received a telegram, and I would refer to it when this matter would be discussed. It was sent from Los Angeles, and it reads as follows:

"Greetings on the 50th birthday of our union. We, the undersigned members of local 96, wish to express our hope that this convention will see fit to apply to the case of Los Angeles Dress Joint Board those traditions of free and democratic trade unionism which established this great organization at its very beginning.

"Fraternally,

"IDA JACKSON.

"JENNY RACKLIFF.

"MARY LEVINE.

"RAE BECKER.

"SARAH DORNER."

The reason I wanted to read this telegram was because Sarah Dorner's name was on the telegram. When I was in Los Angeles immediately after the adjournment of the American Federation of Labor Convention in 1947, I had a committee in my room consisting of representatives of the cloak joint board and of the dress joint board. I informed these delegations separately that the general executive board of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, democratically elected by its members and entrusted with the destinies and the welfare of the membership, decided that it is in the interest of the members and of the union to comply with the law and sign the non-Communist affidavits.

And I know I told them that the Communist Party decided otherwise, and I asked them, "Will you comply with the decisions of your union or will you comply with the decisions of the Communist Party?" and the answer was that they needed time to consider it.

And this woman has the nerve and the audacity to speak of free and democratic trade unionism. Free democratic trade unionism means that we make the decisions; we, the members; we, the officers; we, the union; and we decide the policies according to our conscience, according to our interests, and according to our laws; and that any member who acts in the union according to the orders and decisions of the Communist Party cannot be called a free trade unionist. [Applause.]

Delegate Springer, please don't consider us a bunch of darned fools. When you say that two business agents stayed in the office for a year and we have jeopardized the agreement of the sportswear industry because Levy did not hold the elections, it is correct. Of course, Levy told you not to hold the election. I told Levy not to permit elections because we didn't want to exchange one Communist for another Communist. [Applause.]

And are you trying to create the impression here that because we had a strike and these officers were put on committees during the strike, that this in any way justified your double talk, your double-dealing, your double-loyalty?

Of course, when we have a strike and you give us Communists as officers, and we want the organization to be represented, we, unfortunately, have got to put them on the committees, and Levy wanted to get the support of the cloakmakers joint board, but this is the kind of material that you had available for us. What we are trying to do is make sure that when we have a strike in the future we will have loyal manpower and we won't have to count on Communists. [Applause.]

You know that I am presiding here. You know that I know the game of communism and Communist tactics. You are trying to tell this convention that you have complied with the GEB directives. Whom did you elect, after the committee had left Los Angeles, to represent the locals in the central body? Didn't you send Communists although the directives were specific that you should first consult the supervisor? And didn't you embarrass the international

union when the central body of Los Angeles would not seat them because they were known Communists, and these locals are not represented in the central body even today because they have not complied and they did not want to elect loyal international representatives to represent them in that body? [Applause.]

You have complied when you have levied assessments for organization work without consulting with the supervisor, and he supported you because he is a good unionman. And then you have appointed three organizers that he told you not to appoint, and you have defied him. And then I had to send you a telegram that if you don't comply, you will be kicked out and only then did you comply. [Applause.]

Do you comply in the same spirit when the Communists give you the orders? Have you got a different method for compliance when the Communists advise you?

You may have chosen, you and your comrades, whether you are a member of the Communist Party or not, to serve two gods, to serve the Communist Party and to serve our union. No, you can serve only one god. Either you serve the Communist Party or you serve our union. [Applause.]

Delegates, we will now proceed with the voting on the recommendation of the committee.

Sister FANNIE BORAX. I believe our election and the delegates I have brought to this convention have proved that our stand and our ideology is that of the international union, and just because Springer is at the convention does not mean that he expresses the opinion of the members of local 96. Local 96, with a great majority, has elected two delegates who are present at this convention. I must protest Brother Levy's remarks about the leadership of the joint board. The dress joint board has complied with the decisions of the committee and is following the line of the international.

I hope that this clarified the issue as far as the dress joint board and the delegates of local 96 are concerned. Thank you.

President DUBINSKY. The report of the committee does make this qualification about the dress joint board and also a qualification about local 84 and about local 97, the pressers' union.

All those who favor the adoption of the committee's recommendation will please signify by a show of hands. All opposed to the committee's recommendation will please signify by a show of hands. The entire convention with the exception of three votes has approved the recommendation of the committee.

I declare the recommendations adopted. I declare it as a mandate of this convention. The general executive board will carry it out, and I do hope that the membership of Los Angeles will cooperate fully with the general executive board. [Applause.]

Vice President Levy, make it short, we are a half-hour overtime.

Vice President LEVY. Although I had decided not to participate in the discussion as far as Los Angeles is concerned, I ask now for a minute of indulgence on the part of the convention on a point of personal privilege just to say 2 or 3 words.

I want to say, delegates, that I thank you for the support, and I want to say to the president that finally, after years of talk, after years of misery and suffering, our convention has taken the stand that it should have taken a long time ago. And to me it is a happy event. It is the happiest day of my life because you have no idea what we had to go through all these years, myself, and all the other officers, all the other loyal members of our international in the sportswear union and the cloakmakers union.

Thank heavens for the final decision you have made, and let's hope at the next convention we will never have the same situation as we had to face at this. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask: Do you know the names of any other persons, Mr. Gladnick, who knew Joe Springer by the name of Joe Saul?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I think Sid Hoff, the cartoonist, was a member of our unit. He would know.

There was Steve Schweitzer, a member of that unit.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know where Steve Schweitzer is today?

Mr. GLADNICK. To the best of my knowledge, the last I ever seen of him, he owned a coffee place on 59th Street between 3d and 2d Avenues.

Mr. SCHERER. What was the first name of the first person you said knew Springer by the name of Saul?

Mr. GLADNICK. Sid Hoff, the cartoonist.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that address in New York City?

Mr. GLADNICK. His cartoons—

Mr. KEARNEY. No—the address you gave.

Mr. GLADNICK. Leggett Avenue? Yes; that is New York City—Bronx, N. Y.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you—

Mr. GLADNICK. Sid Hoff—I don't know his address, but he is a very well-known cartoonist.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, could you give us the names of any other individuals that knew Springer by the name of Saul?

Mr. GLADNICK. There was Steve Schweitzer.

There was Naomi Workman.

Mr. SCHERER. Where is Naomi Workman, if you know?

Mr. GLADNICK. To the best of my knowledge, she lived in the Bronx. She used to be a telephone operator in the district New York office of the Communist Party in 1939.

There is—this is many years ago. It's so hard to just pick people.

Steve Schweitzer, Naomi Workman, and Sid Hoff—let's see; I'm trying to think—

Mr. SCHERER. Well, could you at a later date—

Mr. GLADNICK. If I think of any I knew, I will gladly send you the names.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know other individuals who knew Springer as Saul?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes; I do, but I just can't recall their names.

Mr. SCHERER. All right.

What name did Springer use when he was in New York?

Mr. GLADNICK. Joe Saul, in the Young Communist League.

Now, he might have worked in a shop under the name of Springer. He might have received his mail under the name of Springer, but as far as those within the Communist Party—they knew him only under the name of Joe Saul.

Now, there may be people who knew him as Springer in New York. I don't know.

Mr. SCHERER. You will give to the committee or its staff at a later date the names of—

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Other individuals who knew Springer by the name of Saul—

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). And know that he used that name here in New York?

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes.

That was his party—Young Communist League name, as an organizer of that unit on Leggett Avenue.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Is counsel through with his questions?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. He is through, and I want to call attention of the committee there will be a recess or adjournment for the day at 3:30.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I have a few questions I think are important. Why did the Young Communist League members—you have named, I think, five of them who went to the Brooklyn Navy Yard, taking apprentice training, and so forth—deliberately take training as mechanics and otherwise in order to infiltrate in the Brooklyn Navy Yard? What connection did that have with the program of the Young Communist League?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, as I mentioned in the very beginning, the 21 points of admission of any national Communist Party into the Communist International—that was 1 of the points—1 of the 21 points was they would carry on work within the armed—would carry on work for—to subvert and destroy the armed forces of their particular nation.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean that then it was a fixed policy by the Young Communist League in America at that time that they would destroy the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. GLADNICK. Anyone who gets a copy of the 21 points of admission to the Communist International can read it. It is there in black and white.

Mr. DOYLE. And your answer, then, is "Yes" to my question?

Mr. GLADNICK. Absolutely so.

Mr. DOYLE. I understood you to say something about this Mr. Wilson or Velson, it being understood he would become the Secretary of Defense—I think you used the language "if the Communists take over."

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, within the hearts and ranks of the Communist Party there is always the hope that one of these days there's going to be Soviet America; and, of course, I was under that delusion, too, until I met the Russians.

However, to the Russians, the American Communists were nothing but contemptible traitors that could be used, and are being used, very effectively.

But in the hearts, I think, of every Young Communist at that time there was—they were looking toward the day—or toward the day of the revolution when this country will be run as a Soviet republic.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean, then, that, to your personal knowledge, it was talked of as a possibility—that, within the lifetime of Young Communists then in being, there would be a revolution in which the Communists would take over the control of the Government of the United States?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, 1930, 1931, and 1932, in Communist jargon, was called a period of wars and revolutions, and it was almost as though the coming of the Communist Messiah was just around the corner—pointing to the struggles in Germany, to the struggles in Europe and other countries—and it was a question of gradually the capitalist chain would be smashed and, of course, the last bastion of world capitalism, our own United States, will fall crumbling into the hands of the Communists.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, do you feel, as far as you now know, there is any such feeling against the system of government and the American way of life by the Communist Party in America?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I don't think they've changed their general program. They may have changed their immediate tactics, because the Communist Party of the United States, as I found out in Spain, working for the Russians, is nothing but an adjunct of Soviet Military Intelligence; and, of course, that's the line that they feed them—that you boys will become the Soviet leaders when we take over.

Mr. DOYLE. Does that mean, then, members of the American Communist Party owe their allegiance to the Soviet, to Soviet Russia, in preference to the United States of America, generally speaking?

Mr. GLADNICK. I will say this: The hard core of old-time Communists—and I will say Mr. Velson is one of them—know definitely they are serving in the Soviet Red Army. There might be some that are still not completely drawn in, that actually might think they are radicals trying to create social revolution.

However, after 1939 I doubt if anybody could be a fellow traveler and not know he was playing the Soviet tune.

Of course, in 1939 the Communist movement—up until then, it was the strong so-called anti-Nazi movement. In 1939 Molotov went to Berlin and said nazism was a question of taste, and any man who could swallow that statement—that nazism or fascism was a question of taste—I think he'll do anything that Moscow wants him to do.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, then, I wish to direct the witness' attention to two short provisions of Public Law 831, because it is our own legislative history by the United States Congress, by which members of this committee—no; I think we have two new members on the committee, but the rest of us were all Members of this Congress which enacted the Internal Security Act, and that act by the United States Congress declared in part:

As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Congress finds hereby that there exists a world Communist movement which, in its origin, its development and present practices, is a worldwide revolutionary movement, whose purpose is, by treachery, by deceit, by infiltration into other groups, government and otherwise, espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world through the medium of a worldwide Communist organization.

The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

Now, from your experience, was that declaration by the United States Congress, under Public Law 831, in the year 1950, true and correct?

Mr. GLADNICK. Absolutely, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Your answer is what?

Mr. GLADNICK. Absolutely correct.

Mr. DOYLE. One further question, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GLADNICK. It's not an international conspiracy. It's a national conspiracy, run by the Russian National Communist Party. In other words, the word "international" leaves the word—impression that the American Communists might have some say in this setup.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, will you please differentiate on that point for us?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I will say this: That the American Communist Party doesn't even have the privilege of sneezing when orders come from Moscow. They just carry those orders out. If they have to say black is white, they say black is white.

In other words, it's a national conspiracy, a foreign conspiracy, against the United States, and these fellows are just Russian agents. They're not part of any international setup, except in the set point of view that they are the American agents of a Russian setup.

MR. MOULDER. They have no voice in international party affairs whatsoever?

MR. GLADNICK. None whatsoever.

Robert Minor used to sit like an office boy outside of the Russian intelligence office, and the officer used to pencil—circle his name and say, "Keep that Yankee waiting there. It makes them better comrades when they don't run into us so easily."

MR. DOYLE. What year was that?

MR. GLADNICK. 1937.

MR. DOYLE. Then, may I put this question this way: When the American soldiers in Korea a few months ago told me in Korea, where I was for Congress, that the aggressive military movement in Korea was but part and parcel of the aggressive Soviet Communist attack on all free peoples of the world, were they telling me the truth, in your judgment?

MR. GLADNICK. I'm glad to hear that the American GI's have such well-developed political concepts of world affairs.

MR. DOYLE. Your answer, then, is "Yes"?

MR. GLADNICK. I think our GI's know more than a lot of our other people in this country.

MR. DOYLE. Under our assignment, under Public Law 601, part of our assignment is to report back to the United States Congress ways and means in which that Congress should consider legislation dealing with subversive activities.

Now, may I say that term "subversive" in that connection not only applies to the Communist Party, but to any subversive person or group or persons—

MR. GLADNICK. Well, sir—

MR. DOYLE. But in line of the fact this subcommittee is here—

MR. GLADNICK. Pardon me, sir.

MR. DOYLE (continuing). Gathering information—

MR. GLADNICK. May I ask you a point of information?

MR. DOYLE. Yes.

MR. GLADNICK. You see, the Communists try to identify themselves in this country with all people who have independent ideas.

Now, I frankly consider myself a man of independence and not what you would call accepted ideas.

This country was founded on radicalism. This country was founded on the fact that every man could think as he darn well pleases when he wants to.

MR. DOYLE. That's right.

MR. GLADNICK. Now, the Communist is not an independent thinker. He is not a radical. He will be a monarchist if the Communist line is monarchism. He will be a fellow Fascist when the line is fascism. He is not an independent or radical thinker, and I want that in the record, and I—

MR. DOYLE. In other words, he has no freedom of independent thinking?

MR. GLADNICK. None whatsoever. None whatsoever.

MR. DOYLE. But may I conclude my question, then?

I am glad you interrupted me.

Have you any suggestion to make to this subcommittee or this committee of the United States Congress in the field of legislation?

Have you any recommendation to make to us dealing with subversive activities in our country?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well——

Mr. DOYLE. If you haven't gone into that field yet, may I invite you to think of it and give us at a later date——

Mr. GLADNICK. I will be very glad——

Mr. DOYLE. The benefits of your recommendations.

Mr. GLADNICK. I will be very glad to do that at a later date.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the witness for his very illuminating testimony here this afternoon. It has given the committee a great deal of insight into the activities of the Communists in this vicinity and others throughout the United States.

Mr. KEARNEY. There is only one question, Mr. Gladnick.

Mr. GLADNICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. You spoke during your very fine testimony here today—and what I would call the fantastic picture that you have painted—about a proposed infiltration of the National Guard.

Now, I think I can sum that up——

Mr. GLADNICK. It is not proposed, sir. It is an actual infiltration in the Nation Guard.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, an actual infiltration—and it was in the thirties, was it?

Mr. GLADNICK. That's right, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. And the sum and substance of that infiltration, as far as the word "infiltration" is concerned, is that it was a colossal failure, was it not?

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, I don't know if it was or if it was not. I do know this: These chaps who went into the Brooklyn Navy Yard rose rather high.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, wait a minute. There wasn't any National Guard in the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Mr. GLADNICK. Well, they were National Guard men outside of the navy yard.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean National Guard men who worked——

Mr. GLADNICK. National Guard men who worked——

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). In the Brooklyn Navy Yard?

Mr. GLADNICK (continuing). Who worked in it.

You see, you can never say there was a thorough failure. You remember after the World War when we had this we-want-to-go-home business, where our greatest Army this country had ever assembled disintegrated before our eyes with just a handful of Communists.

I would say—not say there was a thorough failure. I think Velson did a master job for his masters.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, it also leads me to another thought: You hear individuals speak that the number of Communists in the country are relatively small. That doesn't enter into the picture at all, does it?

Mr. GLADNICK. Not at all, sir. If you take a small group of Communists and give them a key situation in the United States, the Philippines, or any European country, they can do a great deal.

Mr. KEARNEY. And just a few of them can come in and take over control of a labor union?

Mr. GLADNICK. No; you see—I will disagree with you on this—in the labor movement, the working stiff is a peculiar guy. He can't follow the zigzags of the Communist Party. He might swallow their line to a point, but when the party does a flip-flop the American workingman can't turn around.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, isn't it true that even today, with the thorough housecleaning that the A. F. of L. and CIO have done in their Communist-controlled unions, there are some labor unions in the country today that are controlled?

Mr. GLADNICK. It's true, but I think a little more publicity on this fact—I doubt if those people who work in the factories, who are dominated by the Communists—if they knew the facts——

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, you can't fool the average workingman?

Mr. GLADNICK. Not the workingman. You might fool some of these pseudointellectuals, where a good majority of them were in the Communist Party—and I know now I will be attacked for attacking the intellectuals; but they're supposed to have brains enough to withstand such attacks.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I will say this to you: Thanks to the committee, you have plenty of company. So, don't let it worry you.

Any other questions?

Mr. KUNZIG. No, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I want to excuse the witness, with the great thanks of the committee for the fine manner in which you have testified here today.

Is there a further witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. Irving Velson.

Mr. VELSON. I can't see with all these things in my eyes. Will you turn them off, please?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Velson, I believe, is present to be sworn.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Velson, do you swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. VELSON. I do.

Will you shut the lights off, please?

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe the witness is requesting that the lights——
Would you direct your request to the chairman, please?

Mr. VELSON. Get the lights off, please.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the lights disturb you in your testimony?

Mr. VELSON. They do.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well——

Mr. VELSON. Turn them off.

What do you say—get them off.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, if there are any directions to the cameramen, so that the witness and the Chair will start off even, I will issue the instructions and not you.

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe the witness is accompanied by counsel.

Would counsel please identify his name and office address for the record?

Mr. SHAPIRO. Samuel P. Shapiro, 76 Beaver Street, New York.

TESTIMONY OF IRVING CHARLES VELSON, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, SAMUEL P. SHAPIRO

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give your full name for the record, please?

Mr. VELSON. Irving Charles Velson.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present address?

Mr. VELSON. 1798 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. 1798, did you say—

Mr. VELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.?

Mr. VELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, would you please ask these gentlemen to pay attention to your orders?

Mr. KEARNEY. All right. If the press is finished, we will proceed without any further picture taking.

Mr. VELSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Velson, would you give the committee, please, a summary of your educational background?

Mr. VELSON. Well, I went to Public School 156 in Brooklyn. I went to Thomas Jefferson High School. I went to Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute.

About all I can think of.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you finally complete your educational training?

Mr. VELSON. In—

Mr. KUNZIG. The date.

Mr. VELSON. Well, I don't remember exactly. I think it was in 1929—maybe 1930. I'm not sure at the moment.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your—

Mr. VELSON. When I was about 17.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present age, sir?

Mr. VELSON. I am 39.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, could you give the committee a résumé of your employment background?

Mr. VELSON. Since when?

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, since the time you were first employed.

Mr. VELSON. I don't remember all the jobs I had.

Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I have—

Mr. VELSON. What is this?

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I have asked—

Mr. VELSON. What is this?

Mr. KEARNEY. I have asked the cameramen not to take any more pictures over the witness' objection, and that stands as an order of the Chair.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's start with your employment from the time you finished your educational training.

Mr. VELSON. My first job was at the—as an electrician's helper. I think I got 20 cents an hour.

Mr. KUNZIG. Roughly, when was that?

Mr. VELSON. Around 1929 or 1930. I don't remember that detail, but either one of those 2 years. I think the contractor's name was Fishbein.

Mr. KUNZIG. And what was your next employment?

Mr. VELSON. I worked in the textile—textile mill. I worked 12 hours a night, 30 cents an hour, and had to sign a yellow-dog contract to hold the job.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, let's just talk about the type of work you did now.

Did you work for a union at that time?

Mr. VELSON. That was part of the job. The yellow-dog contract had to be signed; otherwise you couldn't get the job for 30 cents an hour and 12 hours a night.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you work for a union at that time?

Mr. VELSON. It was a scab shop—an open shop.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you work for a union at that time?

Mr. VELSON. I worked for Julius Kaiser Textile Co.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, then, give us the next employment, please.

Mr. VELSON. I don't—I don't know. I worked for—I don't know; I can't remember every single job I had in between.

Mr. KUNZIG. Give us those you can remember, please.

Mr. VELSON. I think I worked for Harold Nathan Press.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where was that?

Mr. VELSON. New York City; somewhere on the west side; I don't remember.

Mr. KUNZIG. What type of work did you do there?

Mr. VELSON. I was a boy in the printshop.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right; what was the next that you can remember?

Mr. VELSON. Well, then I had some odd jobs on the docks, I guess, picking up nuts and bolts.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you work on the docks?

Mr. VELSON. After the Harold Nathan job.

Mr. KUNZIG. Roughly the date, please.

Mr. VELSON. Maybe 1930 to 1931; somewhere around there.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right; let's keep on from there. That is a long time ago. What other jobs have you had from then until 1953?

Mr. VELSON. I worked in the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you work in the Brooklyn Navy Yard?

Mr. VELSON. 1931 to 1939.

Mr. KUNZIG. From 1931 to 1939?

Mr. VELSON. Right.

Mr. KUNZIG. What type of work did you do in the Brooklyn Navy Yard?

Mr. VELSON. I was a shipfitter.

Mr. KUNZIG. Shipfitter.

Was that for the entire time, or did you have any other type of work?

Mr. VELSON. Well, I think I was a loftsmen. I'm not sure if my classification was ever changed or not.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right; after 1939 where have you worked?

Mr. VELSON. Oh, I worked on several boiler jobs—construction jobs.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where?

Mr. VELSON. I can't remember; around here.

Mr. KUNZIG. In New York, you mean?

Mr. VELSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you in the armed services?

Mr. VELSON. I was in the Navy from 1944 to 1946.

Mr. KUNZIG. In what capacity?

Mr. VELSON. Shipfitter, second class.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right; after 1946, what type of work have you been doing?

Mr. VELSON. I worked in the shipyards.

Mr. KUNZIG. Around New York?

Mr. VELSON. Around New York.

I was business agent of—I was president of local 13 of the Shipbuilders' Union, CIO, for about seven times; but I worked at the same time.

Mr. KUNZIG. During what period of time was that?

Mr. VELSON. Oh, I was president on and off from 1941 until about 1946, I think—or 1947, I think. I am not sure exactly of the exact dates.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever connected with the United Auto Workers, CIO, Local 259?

Mr. VELSON. I haven't got to that yet.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right; take it in turn—keep to what was next after the one you just named.

Mr. VELSON. I worked in a couple of auto plants.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where were they?

Mr. VELSON. Oh, in New York, around the city; then business agent of Local 259, United Automobile Workers.

Mr. KUNZIG. CIO?

Mr. VELSON. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was that?

(At this point Mr. Velson conferred with Mr. Shapiro.)

Mr. VELSON. I don't remember exactly when I commenced that job.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present job?

Mr. VELSON. I'm an ironworker.

Mr. KUNZIG. Connected where?

Mr. VELSON. Working in odd iron shops, wherever I can find work.

Mr. KUNZIG. No particular permanent employment at the moment?

Mr. VELSON. I've been fired lots of jobs.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where are you working at the moment, if you are working?

Mr. VELSON. I am working for Steel Fabricators in Long Island City.

Mr. KUNZIG. Steel Fabricators in Long Island City. Do you have an address for that?

Mr. VELSON. I think it is 1202 Broadway.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you connected with any union activities at the present time?

Mr. VELSON. Member of carpenters' union.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you an officer or official at the present time?

Mr. VELSON. No; just a member.

Mr. KUNZIG. Of any union at the present time?

Mr. VELSON. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, your name, I believe, is Irving Velson; is that correct?

Mr. VELSON. Irving Charles Velson.

Mr. KUNZIG. Irving?

Mr. VELSON. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever gone under the name of Charles Wilson?

Mr. VELSON. I decline to answer that question under article 5 of the Constitution.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean under the fifth amendment of the Constitution?

Mr. VELSON. Fifth amendment.

I stand corrected. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been known as Shavey—S-h-a-v-e-y?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mr. Velson, were you present in the courtroom during the testimony of the last witness?

Mr. VELSON. Part of the time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Part of the time.

Mr. VELSON. Although I didn't hear most of what he said. I'm extremely hard of hearing, and I was sitting way in the back.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever have anything to do with furnishing Communist newspapers to ships in connection with the printing of papers in the Finnish Federation Press at 50 East 13th Street, as was testified to by the last witness?

Mr. VELSON. I decline to answer that question.

Who was the last witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. The last witness' name was Gladnick, in case you didn't hear—G-l-a-d-n-i-c-k.

Mr. SCHIERER. Do you know Mr. Gladnick?

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know Mr. Gladnick?

Mr. VELSON. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. MOULDER. Did he give the reason why he declines to answer?

Mr. KUNZIG. Will the reason always be the previous one given—that you refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. VELSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that understood?

Mr. SHAPIRO. Yes; the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHIERER. If he didn't know him, how can he decline?

You asked who the last witness was.

Mr. KUNZIG. He meant—

Mr. KEARNEY. No; he asked who the last witness was, and the next question was—

Mr. VELSON. I was curious to know his name and occupation.

Mr. KEARNEY. "Do you know him?" and he said, "I decline to answer."

Mr. KUNZIG. All right; let the record show—I think it is agreed now—

Mr. SHAPIRO. It will be the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. The fifth amendment will be the reason for not answering?

Mr. SHAPIRO. That's correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you in charge of the entire military apparatus for the Young Communist League?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was your work with the Young Communist League?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you still a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. VELSON. Same answer, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you introduce the last witness to J. Peters in New York City here?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KUNZIG. You said you worked in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Were you ever a member of the National Guard?

Mr. VELSON. I was.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the New York National Guard?

Mr. VELSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was that while you were connected with the Brooklyn Navy Yard?

Mr. VELSON. I really don't recall. I don't know offhand.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend a Young Communist League convention, as testified by the last witness, sit behind a curtain, hear the entire proceedings and then call a special meeting of district organizers and discuss activity of infiltration within the National Guard and the United States Army by Young Communists?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is there anything funny about these questions, witness?

Mr. VELSON. Sounds kind of fantastic.

Mr. CLARDY. It sure is.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, your answers are very fantastic, also.

Any questions that might be asked you by counsel concerning any—

Mr. VELSON. I'm sorry, sir. I don't hear a word you say.

Mr. KEARNEY. I say: Any questions that might be asked you concerning any alleged Communist activities of yours you would decline to answer?

Mr. VELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have 1 or 2 more, sir.

Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KUNZIG. The last witness testified today and we heard a lot today about hard core—a small group of the top Communists in America today; the hard core. Are you a member of the hard core of the Communist Party today in the United States, as was testified by the last witness?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I have just one more thing, sir, which, with the committee's indulgence, I should like to read for the record.

The investigation of this committee has shown that in or about April of 1951, 18 American trade unionists traveled to Europe under passports issued, in most instances, for travel to France for business and pleasure. These individuals, after arriving in France, immedi-

ately started for the Soviet Union, where they participated in May Day celebrations held in that country. Upon return to the United States, the State Department, I believe, picked up the passports of some of these individuals.

Mr. SCHERER. Good time to pick them up.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, in late June and early July, 10 more trade unionists departed from the United States under American passports, claiming that they were going abroad to various countries in Western Europe as tourists, then went to the Soviet Union.

Esther—E-s-t-h-e-r—Goldberg—G-o-l-d-b-e-r-g—and Clara Shavelson—S-h-a-v-e-l-s-o-n—made arrangements for the travel, and investigation shows funds for passage were handled by an organization known as the American Committee to Survey Trade Union Conditions in Europe.

The American Committee to Survey Trade Union Conditions in Europe is located at 799 Broadway in New York.

Are you, Mr. VELSON, the secretary and apparently the only officer of that organization?

Mr. VELSON. The answer is the same; but there's a document—the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 82d Congress, 1st session—I'm sure you have it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is the answer you are not going to answer the question? Is that it?

Mr. VELSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions. The witness obviously will answer nothing.

Mr. KEARNEY. Any questions by the members of the committee?

Mr. VELSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Just a minute.

Mr. VELSON. Excuse me.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, have you ever at any time engaged in—

Mr. VELSON. My name, sir, is Mr. Velson—not witness.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, don't instruct me how to ask my questions, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let's not get into an argument with the witness.

The committee member is perfectly within his rights by calling you witness.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever engaged in any subversive activities against this Nation?

Mr. VELSON. My answer to that question is the same as all previous questions which have been asked me.

Mr. SCHERER. Are you an agent of the Russian Government, either directly or indirectly?

Mr. VELSON. My answer is the same.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. KEARNEY. The witness is excused, and the committee will recess until 10 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 3:20 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Thursday, May 7, 1953.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

Page

Abrams, Mrs.	1379
Abzug, Bella	1370-1376
Amariglio, David	1390, 1391
Ames (Communist Party name for Mrs. Abrams)	1379
Antonini, Luigi	1399, 1400, 1403, 1407, 1408
Ashe, Harold J.	1348, 1357-1359, 1365
Ashe, Mrs. Mildred	1359, 1360, 1363
Bacus, Glenn O.	1351
Bagno, Morris	1401, 1403, 1407, 1408
Bard, Phil	1391
Bassett, W. J.	1400
Bates, Dean	1373
Becker, Rae	1409
Belayev, Colonel	1389
Belfrage, Cedric	1361, 1362
Berkeley, Martin	1360, 1361, 1369, 1374
Berry, A. W.	1379
Biberman, Herbert	1361, 1362
Bioff	1350
Borax, Fannie	1410
Boudin, Leonard B.	1343-1370
Breslaw, Joseph	1399, 1400, 1403, 1407
Bridges, Harry	1361
Browne	1350
Chakin, George	1391, 1392
Compe	1392
Compensino	1391
Cohen, Robert	1392
Curran, Joe	1383
Daggett, Mrs. Charles	1374
Di Maggio, Margaret	1401, 1403
Dorner, Sarah	1401, 1409
Drummond, Dave	1392
Dubinsky, David	1401, 1403, 1404, 1406, 1408-1410
Ellis, Bill	1392
Funn, Dorothy	1370
Gandall, Bill	1392
Gannes, Betty	1379
Gannett, Betty	1379
Gates, John (Johnny) (<i>see also</i> Irving Regenstreif)	1389
Gladnick, Robert	1377-1416 (testimony), 1420
Gladstone, Charles	1401
Glasgow	1406
Goldberg, Esther	1422
Gonzales, Valeriano	1391, 1392
Gorchoff, George	1381, 1386, 1395, 1396
Gordon, Hy	1379
Gordon, Mrs. Alice	1379
Gorney, Jay	1370-1376 (testimony)
Gorney, Sandra	1374
Green, Gil	1379
Haas, Jack	1401

	Page
Hannel, Dr.....	1347
Harford, Claire.....	1401
Hines, Red.....	1385
Hoff, Sid.....	1410, 1411
Hunter.....	1392
Isaacman, Morris.....	1401
Jackson, Allan.....	1409
Jackson, Ida.....	1409
Jerome, V. J.....	1360, 1361
Kendzer, Abe.....	1401
Kolowski, Walter.....	1393
Koltzova, Lisa.....	13. 3
Kupperman, Louis.....	1372
Landis, Judge.....	1362, 1368
Lattimore, Owen.....	1367
Lawrence, Bill.....	1393
Lawrence, Marc.....	1345, 1347, 1350, 1355, 1357, 1362, 1364, 1365, 1368, 1369
Leech, John.....	1362, 1364
Leeds, David.....	1391
Lehman, ex-Governor.....	1374
Levine, Mary.....	1409
Levy, Abe F.....	1403, 1407
Levy, Louis.....	1339, 1403, 1404, 1406, 1408-1410
Little, John.....	1393
Malken, Dodo.....	1386, 1395
Markoff, Professor.....	1387
Mendel.....	1386
Mindel, Professor.....	1387
Minor, Bob.....	1389
Morgan, Colonel.....	1351
Morse, Gene.....	1386
Nagler, Isidore.....	1399, 1400, 1403
Nelson, Steve.....	1393
Orloff, Dr.....	1347
Ornitz, Louis.....	1393
Parks, Larry.....	1350
Pegler, Mr.....	1350
Peters, J.....	1386-1388, 1421
Rackliff, Jenny.....	1409
Ranford, Thomas.....	1400
Raymond, Al.....	1381
Raven, Robert.....	1393
Regenstreif, Irving (<i>see also</i> John Gates).....	1389
Richmond, Al.....	1381
Roosevelt, President.....	1351
Sands, Tony.....	1394
Santa Lucia, Anthony (Tony).....	1394
Saul, Joe (<i>see also</i> Joe Springer).....	1383, 1384, 1396-1398, 1410, 1411
Schneiderman, Lou.....	1385, 1386
Schweitzer, Steve.....	1410, 1411
Shane.....	1403, 1406
Shapiro, Samuel P.....	1417-1422
Shavelson, Clara.....	1422
Shavey. (<i>See</i> Charles Wilson; Irving Charles Velson.).....	
Silbert, Mr.....	1406
Skolnik, Yale.....	1394
Sondergaard, Gale.....	1361, 1362
Springer, Joe (<i>see also</i> Joe Saul).....	1383, 1384, 1396-1398, 1406, 1408-1411
Stander, Alice (<i>see also</i> Alice Twitchell).....	1361, 1362
Stander, J. (alias for Lionel Stander).....	1358, 1359
Stander, Lionel.....	1343-1370 (testimony)
Stander, Lucy (formerly Mrs. Lionel Stander).....	1358-1360
Stember, Samuel.....	1394
Stuart, Yale.....	1394
Stulberg, Louis.....	1401

	Page
Taft, Anna	1394
Temple, Shirley	1373
Townsend, Leo	1374
Tuttle, Frank	1360, 1361
Twitchell, Alice (formerly Mrs. Lionel Stander)	1361
Velson, Irving Charles (Charley; Shavey) (<i>see also</i> Charles Wilson)	1385, 1386, 1395, 1396, 1412, 1413, 1416, 1417-1422 (testimony)
Wald, Nat	1381
Williamson, William	1378
Wilson, Alice	1379
Wilson, Charles (Charley; Shavey; <i>see also</i> Irving Charles Velson)	1380, 1385, 1395, 1412, 1420
Wood, Hon. John S.	1346, 1347
Workman, Naomi	1411
Young, Nat (Young Communist League for Nat Wald)	1381
Youngdahl, Judge	1367, 1374

ORGANIZATIONS

American Committee To Survey Trade Union Conditions in Europe	1422
American Federation of Labor	1382, 1400, 1407, 1409, 1416
Baron D. Herb Mechanical Trade School	1395
Brooklyn Navy Yard	1379, 1386, 1395, 1412, 1415, 1418, 1421
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	1417
Bureau of Labor Statistics	1407
California State Labor Federation	1404
Camp Unity	1394
Citizens' Military Training Corps	1395, 1396, 1380, 1381
Civilian Conservation Corps	1388
Coat and Suit Manufacturers' Association, Los Angeles	1404, 1406
Congress of Industrial Organizations	1416, 1419
Federal Bureau of Investigation	1363, 1365, 1370
GPU	1392
International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees	1350
International Brigade	1389, 1390, 1393
International Ladies Garment Workers Union	1378, 1394, 1396, 1399-1410
International Seamen's Union	1382, 1383
Lincoln Battalion	1392, 1394
Los Angeles Central Labor Council	1399, 1400, 1404
Los Angeles Dress Joint Board	1409
Motion Picture Producers' Association	1350
National Guard	1380, 1388, 1395, 1396, 1415, 1421
National Labor Relations Board	1399, 1404, 1408
National Maritime Union	1383
Newspaper Guild	1361
New York Public Library	1382
Oil Field Industrial Workers' Union	1382
Packinghouse Workers' Industrial Union	1382
Reconstruction Finance Corp.	1378
Red International Labor Union	1382
Royal Canadian Air Force	1350, 1351, 1363, 1365
Screen Actors' Guild	1361
Servicio Informacion Militar	1392
Shipbuilders' Union, Local 13	1419
Spanish Aid Committee	1391
Steel Fabricators, Long Island City	1419
Supreme Court (State), New York	1347
Textile Workers' Union, CIO	1378
Trade Union Unity League	1382
Transport Workers' Union	1392
United Auto Workers, CIO, Local 259	1419
United States Air Force	1350, 1351, 1363, 1365
United States Army	1387, 1388, 1396
United States Coast Guard	1388

	Page
United States Navy-----	1387, 1419
Unity House-----	1394
University of Michigan-----	1372, 1375
University of North Carolina-----	1357
Wholesale and Retail Workers Union-----	1394
Workers' School-----	1386

PUBLICATIONS

American Mercury-----	1388
Daily Worker-----	1378, 1388, 1403
Finnish Federation Press-----	1386, 1420
International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, Report and Record of the 27th Convention-----	1399-1410
Los Angeles Citizens-News-----	1361
Los Angeles Times-----	1398
People's World-----	1381, 1408
Sailors' Voice-----	1385, 1386
Shipmates' Voice-----	1385
Worker-----	1381
Young Worker-----	1391



BOSTON

3-9999 05018 316 7

100-1-100-1
INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
NEW YORK CITY AREA—Part 4

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
Congress HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MAY 7, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

CLYDE DOYLE, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, SR., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

C O N T E N T S

May 7, 1953 :

Testimony of—

Page●

Lee S. Sabinson..... 1428

Zachary Schwartz..... 1442

Robert Rossen..... 1454

Index..... 1501

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committees on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 4

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
New York, N. Y.

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:10 a. m., in room 1105 of the United States courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., Hon. Kit Clardy presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman, appearance noted in transcript), Bernard W. Kearney (appearance noted in transcript), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder (appearance noted in transcript), Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance noted in transcript).

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; Leslie C. Scott, research analyst; W. Jackson Jones, Earl L. Fuoss, and George C. Williams, investigators; Dolores Anderson and Thelma Searce, staff representatives; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. CLARDY. The committee will be in order. Are you ready, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Call your first witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Lee Sabinson.

Mr. SABINSON. May I not have the television cameras on?

Mr. CLARDY. We will turn them off.

Mr. SABINSON. Thank you.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you hold up your right hand? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SABINSON. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. Be seated. [Addressing news photographers:]

Take your pictures before he starts testifying, gentlemen.

As soon as they have done that we will start the testimony.

Let the record show the appointment of a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Scherer, Mr. Doyle, and myself.

Are you ready, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. CLARDY. Now, Witness, first I should ask whether the cameras should not be turned off. Does the light bother you at all, or will it bother you in your testimony?

Mr. SABINSON. A little. I have an occupational ailment—weak eyes.

Mr. CLARDY. You do. Mine are bothering me a little today. So, we will cooperate.

Will you gentlemen turn off the lights, please.

**TESTIMONY OF LEE S. SABINSON, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
OSMUND K. FRANKEL**

Mr. KUNZIG. Let the record show the witness is accompanied by the distinguished counsel, Mr. Osmund K. Frankel.

Would you give your office address for the record, Mr. Frankel?

Mr. FRANKEL. 120 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Sabinson, would you give your name for the record, please?

Mr. SABINSON. Lee S. Sabinson.

Mr. KUNZIG. And your—

Mr. CLARDY. How do you spell that?

Mr. SABINSON. S-a-b-i-n-s-o-n.

Mr. KUNZIG. And your address, please, sir?

Mr. SABINSON. 743 Fifth Avenue.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background, sir?

Mr. SABINSON. New York City public schools; New York City high schools; College of the City of New York.

Mr. CLARDY. You are a native New Yorker?

Mr. SABINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you graduate from college?

Mr. SABINSON. I didn't graduate from college. I didn't take my degree. I left—

Mr. KUNZIG. What year did you leave, then?

Mr. SABINSON. 1930.

Mr. KUNZIG. And, now, would you give the committee a résumé of your occupational background, including any theatrical work in which you may have been engaged?

Mr. SABINSON. I was an errand boy during high school, I worked in a printshop. I made parchment out of paper in order to make lamp shades. I was a truckman's helper. I followed the harvest. I became an editor of a publishing house, went to work for picture companies in the editorial department, and then came into the theater professionally.

Among the plays I produced—Finian's Rainbow, Home of the Brave, Trio, Counter-Attack, Biggest Thief in Town.

Mr. CLARDY. You are a producer?

Mr. SABINSON. I am a producer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Sabinson, Martin Berkeley, in his testimony of September 19, 1951, identified you during the time that he knew you as a member of the Communist Party, and a Miss Ettinger¹—E-t-t-i-n-

¹ Eve Ettinger.

g-e-r—in her testimony of September 10, 1951, identified you, stating that she had known you as a member of the Communist Party.

With that preface, may I ask you: Have you ever been at any time a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America? (At this point Mr. Sabinson conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

MR. SABINSON. I am not now a member of the Communist Party, but I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

MR. KUNZIG. As to whether you have ever been a member of the Communist Party?

MR. SABINSON. That's right.

MR. KUNZIG. And as to that question—as to whether you have ever been—you do not answer?

MR. SABINSON. Right.

For the record, could you say at what period these people claimed—

MR. KUNZIG. It would be in the period of 1936, in that period of time, to 1943—roughly in that period of time.

MR. SABINSON. I haven't seen Martin Berkeley since 1937.

MR. KUNZIG. Well, I didn't say Mr. Berkeley testified to that. We would go into it more deeply if you were going to answer the question, but obviously you are not going to answer the question—and that, I believe, covers that situation.

Now, I am going to go into a few of the various Communist fronts here to which you may have lent your name and ask you if you had been connected in any way with these various organizations.

Progressive Citizens of America lists here the names of individuals who supported the National Citizens' Political Action Committee of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. You are listed here, in a group of names, as Lee Sabinson, 69-10 Yellowstone Boulevard, Forest Hills, Long Island.

The Progressive Citizens of America has been cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947, and again in 1948.

Are you the Lee Sabinson whose name is listed here?

MR. SABINSON. As of what year was that listing made?

MR. CLARDY. Will you exhibit that to him, Counsel?

MR. KUNZIG. I will certainly be glad to turn it over to you.

This is Sabinson exhibit No. 1 for identification.

MR. CLARDY. Let it be so marked.

(The photostatic copy of the document referred to, concerning the Progressive Citizens of America, was marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 1" for identification.)

MR. KUNZIG. Now, Mr. Sabinson—

MR. SABINSON. This is a listing that applied in 1947.

When was this organization listed as subversive?

MR. KUNZIG. I just gave the date.

MR. SABINSON. I want to refresh my memory.

MR. KUNZIG. 1947, and again in 1948.

Of course, it was listed as such because of its activities prior to that time.

MR. SABINSON. Yes.

Well, prior to that time I was a member.

Mr. KUNZIG. Prior to the time it was listed.

Mr. SABINSON. Prior to the time it was listed I was a member.

Mr. KUNZIG. And during that time it conducted activities for which it was listed.

I now offer this in evidence, Mr. Chairman, as Sabinson Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. CLARDY. It will be received.

(The photostatic copy of the document previously marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 1" for identification was received in evidence as "Sabinson Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I have here, marked—

Mr. SCHERER. Pardon me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute, Mr. Counsel, before you finish with this.

Mr. KUNZIG. Certainly.

Mr. SCHERER. When did you withdraw from this organization, Mr. Sabinson?

Mr. SABINSON. I have no recollection of ever having become an active member through membership card; nor do I have any recollection of having withdrawn.

As that letter states, these are people who made contributions prior to 1947, and I did make contributions prior to 1947.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; it says here it is listing people, to quote it, "who should be approached for substantial contributions."

Mr. SABINSON. Well, I had a hit play in 1947 called Finian's Rainbow.

Mr. CLARDY. So they tapped you?

Mr. SABINSON. Therefore, it is deemed possible I am available for sizable contributions.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you contribute up to 1947?

Mr. SABINSON. I have no recollection of having contributed.

Mr. SCHERER. You wouldn't say you didn't contribute up to 1947?

Mr. SABINSON. I wouldn't say that I didn't and I wouldn't say I did.

Mr. SCHERER. Then, you—

Mr. SABINSON. I have no recollection.

Actually, in 1947, I moved from the address listed—69-10.

Mr. CLARDY. I see. This was correct up until that time?

Mr. SABINSON. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. And you did make a substantial contribution in the year mentioned?

Mr. SABINSON. I don't think it was substantial; I think possibly \$10, if that's called substantial.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a document marked as "Sabinson Exhibit No. 2" for identification, which is an open letter to President Truman protesting the treatment of the Huks in the Philippines and defending the Huks, which has been pretty well known as a Communist group.

There is a signature on this letter to President Truman of Lee Sabinson.

May I give this to you and ask you to look at it and ask if you were the Lee Sabinson who signed that letter to the President?

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. CLARDY. While he is looking at it, Mr. Reporter, have you noted the entry of Congressman Moulder and Congressman Frazier?

The REPORTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. They are added to the subcommittee at this moment.

Mr. SABINSON. I have absolutely no recollection of that document, which is purported to have been signed in 1946.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't know whether you signed it or not?

Mr. SABINSON. No; I have no recollection.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you lend your name freely to various things of this nature?

Mr. SABINSON. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that your custom, without question to what the situation may have involved?

(At this point Mr. Sabinson conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

Mr. SABINSON. Whenever I found a cause that I deemed worthwhile, wherever it was in recognition of a struggle for decency and wherever such a problem was presented, I lent my name.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you considered the Huks in a struggle for decency?

Mr. SABINSON. I said I had no recollection—

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Mr. SABINSON (continuing). Of this particular thing; but I did lend my name frequently for various things, for which I have many awards, in my fight for tolerance and democracy.

Mr. KUNZIG. In the Washington Post of May 24, 1950, there is an advertisement protesting the decision of the Supreme Court in the case now known as the Hollywood Ten, which was a case involving a man appearing before this committee and refusing to testify.

I hand you this exhibit, marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 3" for identification, and ask you whether your signature or your name, Lee Sabinson, producer, is on that.

(At this point Mr. Sabinson conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

Mr. SABINSON. I'm perfectly willing to answer this question. However, since this is a committee delving into subversive activities, an open advertisement objecting to a Supreme Court decision is not, and I don't think—

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, that is enough of that. That is not a response to any question.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a photostatic copy of "Sabinson Exhibit No. 4," marked such for identification, which is from the Daily Worker, New York, Friday, March 14, 1947. It lists a Lee Sabinson, producer of Finian's Rainbow, as a main speaker under the auspices of the National Negro Congress.

Are you the Lee Sabinson mentioned?

Mr. SABINSON. I was a speaker at the National Negro Congress.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't hear that. You were—

Mr. SABINSON. I was a speaker at the National Negro Congress.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, aside from having testimony adduced before these various hearings in New York, Mr. Chairman, from Mrs. Funn,¹ the first day, as to activities of the National Negro Congress, it has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947 and again in 1948.

¹ Dorothy K. Funn.

Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940, on the ground that it was "deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists."

It was also listed by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1939; again in 1940, 1942, and 1944.

It was listed as a Communist-dominated mass organization in the California Committee on Un-American Activities report in 1947.

William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, U. S. A., stated that the role of his party was "one of central importance in the organization of the great united front National Negro Congress in Chicago, February 1936," as quoted in the Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities report in 1938.

Mr. SABINSON. May I—

Mr. CLARDY. No; there is no question pending.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a document marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 5" for identification, which lists Lee Sabinson, producer of Finian's Rainbow, at a group meeting of the United Negro and Allied Veterans of America.

Are you the Lee Sabinson mentioned there?

I pass you exhibit No. 5 for identification.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, while he is doing that, we better have these others marked, because you did not have them marked, and I think I will pass them back and get them marked before we use them.

Mr. KUNZIG. They have all been marked, and I will put them all in evidence.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you mark with pencil the number you have on there?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. SABINSON. I appeared there, along with Sugar Ray Robinson, to receive an award in the fight for democracy and tolerance.

Mr. KUNZIG. The United Negro and Allied Veterans of America was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947.

I have a photostatic copy of a page of the Daily Worker of Monday, February 16—

Mr. FRANKEL. What year?

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 6" for identification. It states in a headline: "Eighty City Leaders Ask Council Seat Gerson; Issue Up Today." It lists Lee Sabinson, producer, as one of those who wanted to seat Simon W. Gerson to the city council seat made vacant by the death of Councilman Peter V. Cacchione, Brooklyn Communist.

Are you the Lee Sabinson listed in that article?

Mr. FRANKEL. You didn't give the date, or the year.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you put the year in? I'm sorry.

Mr. FRANKEL. 1948.

Mr. SABINSON. I most likely was the Lee Sabinson. Since the people elected Cacchione, I thought his successor most likely should be a Communist, since the people of New York City elected the man.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, may I ask you this: You said you "most likely"—

Mr. SABINSON. Yes; I——

Mr. CLARDY. Did you mean that to be an affirmation that you were the person so identified?

Mr. SABINSON. I have no recollection of this, but most likely this is true because I would today do the same thing.

Mr. CLARDY. In other words, you are in no position to say you were not?

Mr. SABINSON. I am in no position to say I was not.

Mr. SCHIERER. You said today you would urge it?

Mr. SABINSON. If the people elected a Communist, and that Communist died, then I think he should be replaced by a Communist.

Mr. CLARDY. Today?

Mr. SABINSON. Yes, if the people elected the man.

That is the will of the American people, in this instance.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, if the will of the American people were to elect Communists and have a completely Communist government of the United States of America, that would be entirely satisfactory to you?

Mr. SABINSON. Whatever the will of the American people is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Including a Communist government in New York, Washington, or anywhere?

Mr. SABINSON. Whatever the will of the American people is perfectly satisfactory with me, because the people are sovereign.

Mr. KUNZIG. I think you have made your position completely clear.

Now, I have here a document, marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 7" for identification, two pages from the Daily Worker of Wednesday, June 8, 1949, in which there is an article headed "Jailings Spur Rights Parley" and it concerns a meeting of the Civil Rights Congress of New York, and it lists your name or lists the name of Lee Sabinson, Broadway producer, as one of those present at this group.

I pass you exhibit 7 for identification and ask you if you were the Lee Sabinson and if you were part of that meeting.

Mr. SABINSON. I never attended such a meeting.

Mr. KUNZIG. Your name was used improperly by the Daily Worker?

Mr. SABINSON. In this particular instance, yes.

Mr. CLARDY. May I see that?

Mr. KUNZIG. In spite of the fact you have already stated you lent your name frequently, and can't remember all the times you have, you are definite at this particular time you didn't lend your name?

Mr. SABINSON. That's right.

(At this point Mr. Sabinson conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

Mr. SABINSON. That's right.

The question has to do with being present at the meeting.

Mr. KUNZIG. You are definite you were not present at the meeting?

Mr. SABINSON. Definitely not; I wasn't present.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right, I will ask you: Did you allow the Daily Worker to use your name as part of the group?

Mr. SABINSON. I wasn't consulted, nor was I consulted when the Daily Worker attacked me for closing a play.

Mr. CLARDY. At any rate, you did not attend this particular meeting?

Mr. SABINSON. No; I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a document marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 8" for identification—call to the American Continental Congress for Peace, held in Mexico City, September 5–September 10, 1949. Among those listed as United States sponsors is a Lee Sabinson.

The address here is American Continental Congress for Peace, Suite 70, 49 West 44th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

Are you the Lee Sabinson mentioned here, and did you lend your name to the American Continental Congress for Peace?

Mr. SABINSON. I lent my name to every congress for peace, just as President Eisenhower became President on a peace platform.

Mr. CLARDY. You lent your name in this particular instance?

Mr. SABINSON. Yes; I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, I doubt if President Eisenhower lent his name to the American Continental Congress for Peace, which has been cited as another phase in the Communist peace campaign by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities in 1951, in Washington, D. C.

Mr. SABINSON. I do lend my name to every effort in favor of peace.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, there is no question.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, if any organization lists anything for peace, no matter what the background is, you will be free and glad to lend your name?

Mr. SABINSON. For peace; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. For peace.

Now, I have here a letterhead of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 9" for identification, and this is a letter signed by a Henry Pratt Fairchild, and in the back of it Lee Sabinson of New York, N. Y., is listed. It is an item protesting certain handlings of atomic energy, and so forth.

I hand this over to you and ask you if you were the Lee Sabinson who lent his name to the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, that is the outfit we had considerable discussion about on the first day of the hearings here when the Witness Shaw¹ was on the stand?

Mr. KUNZIG. There has been great testimony about that—lengthy testimony.

Mr. SABINSON. I have no recollection of having signed this. This, in fact, is the first time I have seen this.

Mr. CLARDY. Perhaps we should ask you: Had you ever heard of the outfit?

Mr. SABINSON. National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. SABINSON. I was a member.

Mr. CLARDY. But you do not have any recollection of this particular thing covered by—

Mr. SABINSON. None whatsoever.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). This particular exhibit?

Mr. KUNZIG. When were you a member, sir?

Mr. SABINSON. Prior to the date of that letter.

Mr. KUNZIG. When were you a member?

¹ Artie Shaw.

Mr. SABINSON. When we were fighting for the election of President Roosevelt.

Mr. KUNZIG. When were you a member?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; answer as to the date.

Mr. SABINSON. I should say prior to 1949.

Mr. KUNZIG. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions has been cited as a Communist front by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities in March of 1949, and again in 1950.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask, Witness, when you said, "Prior to 1949"—you mean you became a member prior to that?

Mr. SABINSON. And maintained membership prior to, but not after.

Mr. CLARDY. I see. You ceased to be a member some time in 1949?

Mr. SABINSON. Prior to 1949.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, prior to that?

Mr. SABINSON. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. Could you give us the year? Was it 1948?

Mr. SABINSON. I'm not sure about it, but I know it was prior to 1949. I can't because I didn't pay dues. This is my big problem.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, at any rate, you ceased being a member——

Mr. SABINSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). At some time prior to the year 1949?

Mr. SABINSON. Right.

Mr. SCHERER. And you ceased to be a member by reason of the fact you discontinued paying dues?

Mr. SABINSON. And attending meetings.

Mr. SCHERER. And attending meetings.

Did you notify the council?

Mr. SABINSON. No; I notified nobody.

Mr. SCHERER. You didn't notify the council?

Mr. SABINSON. I felt a free agent, and not bound by any blood bounds.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you know whether or not your name may have appeared on the publications or letterheads of that outfit after 1949?

Mr. SABINSON. Well, if you look at the letterhead, I am not listed as a member of the board of directors and——

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't limit it to that. I said in any way.

Mr. SABINSON. I see now a letter, 1950, in which my name was supposed to appear. I know nothing about it.

Mr. CLARDY. You simply haven't notified them of any withdrawal; so, they went ahead and published your name?

Mr. SABINSON. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Right along those lines, Mr. Chairman, I have a paper here, a document, marked "Sabinson Exhibit No. 10" for identification, which is a letter from the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, urging the immediate abolishment of this very committee. One of the names signing it in January 1949 is Lee Sabinson.

I hand you that document and ask you if you were the Lee Sabinson that lent his name to that letter, sir.

Mr. SABINSON. I have no recollection of this.

Mr. SCHERER. You wouldn't say that you didn't, would you?

Mr. SABINSON. No, because if this letter were given to me today I would sign it.

Mr. SCHERER. You would sign it?

Mr. SABINSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I have here—

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you ever a member of the board of directors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. SABINSON. I have been included as a board of director on many—I never attended meetings.

Mr. SCHERER. That wasn't the question.

Mr. SABINSON. I think I was a member of the board of directors at one time.

Mr. SCHERER. You wouldn't say you weren't a member?

Mr. SABINSON. I wouldn't say I wasn't a member. I think I was.

Mr. SCHERER. You just think you were?

Mr. SABINSON. Yes; that's right.

Mr. SCHERER. You can't remember?

Mr. SABINSON. I can't remember.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have two documents here, marked "Sabinson Exhibits Nos. 11 and 12" for identification, the heading of which is "Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy." One is dated January 9, 1947; the next is May 28, 1948. Listed as sponsors on each of these exhibits is a Lee Sabinson.

May I ask that you look at those exhibits and see if you were the Lee Sabinson?

(At this point Mr. Sabinson conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

Mr. SABINSON. I have no recollection of these.

Mr. CLARDY. What do you mean by that—of the particular documents?

Mr. SABINSON. Of the particular documents and sponsoring the organization at all, or ever having attended a meeting of the organization.

Mr. CLARDY. Or having let your name to it in any way whatever?

Mr. SABINSON. I have no recollection of that.

Mr. CLARDY. You again are not in a position to say you did not, because of your past policy?

Mr. SABINSON. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. You may have?

Mr. SABINSON. I may have, but I have no recollection of it.

Mr. KUNZIG. The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has been cited as Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1949 and the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948 had this to say:

The Communist Party line shifted after V-J Day and Communist fronts started pressure on the administration in reference to its foreign policy in China in order to clear the way for Soviet expansion. A new front in this field is the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. I should like, at this time, Mr. Chairman, to offer in evidence Sabinson exhibit Nos. 2 through 12.

Mr. CLARDY. They will be received.

(The photostatic copy of an open letter to President Truman, released by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy on October 7, 1946, was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 2.)

(The photostatic copy of an advertisement entitled "The Right To Speak or the Right To Remain Silent," appearing in the May 24, 1950, issue of the Washington Post, was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 3.)

(The photostatic excerpt from the March 14, 1947, issue of the Daily Worker was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 4.)

(The photostatic copy of an excerpt from the May 24, 1947, issue of the Daily Worker was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 5.)

(The photostatic copy of a page from the February 16, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 6.)

(The photostatic copy of 2 pages from the June 8, 1949, issue of the Daily Worker was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 7.)

(The photostatic copy of the Call to the American Continental Congress for Peace, held September 5-10, 1949, was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 8.)

(The photostatic copy of a letter dated July 28, 1950, from the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, signed by Henry Pratt Fairchild, was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 9.)

(The photostatic copy of a letter dated January 1949, from the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 10.)

(The photostatic copy of a letter dated January 9, 1947, from the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, signed by Emily Sanchez, was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 11.)

(The photostatic copy of a letter dated May 28, 1948, from the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy was received in evidence as Sabinson exhibit No. 12.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I should like, finally, to ask once more of this witness, who obviously does not remember very well to what type of groups he lent his name through these past years, and freely lent his name, whether he at any time has been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SABINSON. I will repeat: I stand on the privilege granted me under the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you decline to answer?

Mr. SABINSON. And decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Is my recollection correct, Mr. Sabinson, that you said you were not a member of the party today?

Mr. SABINSON. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the party yesterday?

Mr. SABINSON. No; I was not.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the party last year?

(At this point Mr. Sabinson conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

Mr. SABINSON. My attorney tells me I can go that far. I was not.

Mr. SCHERER. All right; were you a member of the party in 1951?

(At this point Mr. Sabinson conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

Mr. SABINSON. My attorney says I must stand on my constitutional privilege.

Mr. SCHIERER. That is all.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman.

May I say, Mr. Sabinson, while you haven't said it, and while you don't need to do so, nevertheless, I think I recognize in your preliminary statement the way you had to work yourself up in our American system. I want to compliment you in doing what you have done to reach the pinnacle in your profession.

Mr. SABINSON. Thank you. Now, if I can only maintain it.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, certainly this committee doesn't wish you less than the maintenance of your pinnacle in your arts and sciences; but I am wondering, because you are not now a member of the Communist Party, regardless of whether you ever were, or when you withdrew, if you were at one time a member, in view of your letter that you signed to the 81st Congress advocating the abolishment of this committee, if you were aware of a couple of things, in view of the fact you lent your name to so many letters and so many organizations, without apparently having time or taking time to carefully inspect each one, I wonder if it couldn't well be that you were not also well enough informed when you did sign this letter to the 81st Congress about why this committee was constituted.

Now, I am making that preliminary statement because I am not going to try to ask you whether or not you are now a Communist or whether or not you ever were. I won't put you in that position again. You stood on your constitutional rights.

We also recognize that as a constitutional right, and I wish to assure you that in my few questions that I will ask you I will not try to put you in a position to deliberately or otherwise have you violate your conscientious constitutional scruples, which we always admire and respect when they are given in good faith.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). I am wondering if there isn't an area, as long as you are a non-Communist now, of helpfulness you can give this committee.

That is one reason we are here, under an express direction of your Congress, under Public Law 601, which was passed in 1945, which charged us with investigating the extent and the character and the objects of subversive activities in this country, whether originating in the United States or originating in foreign countries, and then it challenged us and assigned us to also investigate or report back to Congress any question with reference to subversive activities that would aid the United States Congress in any legislation.

Were you familiar at all with this statute when you signed that letter—that this was a statutory charge to this committee, and has been since 1945?

Mr. SABINSON. I believe I was.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, may I ask you, then, this being an express direction of your United States Congress: Do I understand, then, that one reason you signed this letter advocating the abolishment of the committee in 1949 was because you felt that it wasn't wise or

necessary to have such a committee investigating subversive activities in the United States?

Mr. SABINSON. Do you want my answer to that?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. SABINSON. All right. I think this committee investigating subversive activities has succeeded in the economic strangulation of so many men of good will.

Mr. CLARDY. Wait a minute. Witness. That wasn't the question.

Mr. SABINSON. No; just a moment—I—

Mr. CLARDY. Will you please desist.

Mr. Reporter, will you read the concluding part of that question?

I want you to answer it directly or not at all. Listen to it carefully. He asked you a specific question about a specific reason.

Mr. FRANKEL. No; no.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel will not be heard, as you know.

Will you—

Mr. FRANKEL. Could you repeat the question, please?

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Read the question, Mr. Reporter.

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

Do I understand, then, that one reason you signed this letter advocating the abolishment of the committee in 1949 was because you felt that it wasn't wise or necessary to have such a committee investigating subversive activities in the United States?

(At this point Mr. Sabinson conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

Mr. SABINSON. I believe there should be such a committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, were you also aware of the Internal Security Act of 1950, under which statute, an act of your Congress, the Congress declared, as a result of evidence before a congressional committee, there did exist a world Communist movement which, in its development and its practice, was a worldwide revolutionary movement?

I will not read further from the text, but I am wondering if you also were familiar with that statute by your Congress.

Mr. SABINSON. I am.

Mr. CLARDY. You are reading directly from the—

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Statute itself, are you not, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Now, I lay that ground for just 2 or 3 questions, Mr. Chairman, because, in view of the fact that this gentleman has declared he is not a Communist, I take it for granted that if you feel there is a Communist conspiracy against the American form of government you will cooperate with this committee and help us in the area of subversive activities, if you are familiar with any of them.

Mr. SABINSON. If I am familiar with any subversive activities, I will cooperate.

And at this point may I tell you that in 86th Street in New York City on Friday night there was a Bundist meeting, at which Senator McCarthy was "heiled," and again at this Friday there is going to be such a meeting.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, that is not germane.

Mr. SABINSON. I am sorry.

Mr. CLARDY. There will be no laughter in this hearing room during the time I am chairman or you will all be expelled from the room—and I mean all.

Now, if that is repeated once more, I shall ask the officers to open the door and put everybody out of the hearing room.

Now, if you don't understand plain English, I will repeat it if it becomes necessary.

Now, will you proceed?

Mr. DOYLE. May I say, Mr. Sabinson, I am dead sure this committee is interested in all forms of subversive activities against our form of government, wherever it exists, or by whatever person or by whatever group, not only the Communist Party in America; but you made an observation with reference to an advertisement which I think I want to call to your attention and, if I am not in error, straighten out your thinking, if I can.

You referred to the advertisement on May 24, 1950, in the Washington Post, and I wrote down as quickly as I could your exact language. You said, "However, that was a public advertisement and could not be subversive."

I think that was about the way you worded it.

Now, as I understand the ordinary wording and meaning of the term subversive, it doesn't have to be secret. The purpose of a person can be even displayed in public.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

I just wanted to mention that, because I felt that perhaps you felt it was in a public ad and—

Mr. SABINSON. I think I would like to refer to Fowler's Dictionary of English on the meaning of subversiveism. It is—

Mr. CLARDY. That is not involved in the question at all.

Mr. SABINSON. It is a semantic question.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, it is not called for in the answer you are about to give.

Mr. SABINSON. I am not about to give an answer. I just want to know what the word subversive means, actually.

Mr. CLARDY. If you do not know at this juncture—

Mr. SABINSON. I have always thought it meant—

Mr. CLARDY. If you do not know at this juncture, it would be useless to try to educate you in the few moments still available.

Mr. SABINSON. But not pointless.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have a further question, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. SABINSON. Pardon me, Mr. Doyle. May I ask a question.

Mr. CLARDY. No; you may not.

Mr. DOYLE. I think I want to ask the witness this question concerning his answer on peace.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In answer to our counsel, when he asked, "No matter what the background of the organization is, you would lend your name to it for peace, would you?", you said, "Yes."

I understood you to say that.

Mr. SABINSON. You understood correctly, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, do I understand by that, then, that even though it might develop, as it has developed, that the American Communist Party has, without question, promulgated programs allegedly for peace but which have been part of their conspiracy to support the Soviet Communist line in this country, nevertheless, you have and would continue to support such programs merely because they had the word "peace" on them or claimed to be campaigns for peace?

Mr. SABINSON. At the moment we have a team of negotiators in Panmunjom. They are negotiating for peace, and I am for that team of negotiators.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, all of us are, aren't we?

Mr. SABINSON. This is the important move for peace at this particular moment.

Mr. DOYLE. Correct, and some of us have lost our children in uniform in the interest of peace.

Mr. SABINSON. Surely.

Mr. DOYLE. They have given more than you and I have given. They've given much more.

But that isn't quite my question. You see, when I was in Korea and the Far East a few months ago for the United States Congress, I asked over 300 men in uniform whether or not there was any connection between the military aggression in Korea and the subversive conspiracy in the United States, in their judgment, and the answer, unanimously, was, "It's one and the same campaign"—one and the same campaign; the military aggression in Korea and the Communist conspiracy in this country—one and the same.

Now, I didn't want to take advantage of you at all as a witness in the chair, but I do feel, you not being a Communist now, according to your testimony under oath, are in a position to counteract and undo, I think, some of the manifest harm that has been done during previous days by the use of your distinguished name in the interest of peace movements which were not, in fact, peace movements but were part of the Communist conspiracy; and I just want to urge you, as one American to another, to see if there isn't some pretty vigorous way that you can help overcome the use or the misuse of your distinguished name in your own art and profession, in the interest of things that are not tainted with subversive activities, even though you may not have known it at the time.

Mr. MOULDER. Would the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Sabinson, you said you are not now a member of the Communist Party. Would you state and give the reasons or explanation to the committee why you are not now a member and you were at one time a member, that is, as to why you disassociated or are no longer affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. SABINSON. In order to maintain my privilege under the Constitution, under the fifth amendment of the Constitution, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SABINSON. Thank you.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have anything further?

Mr. KUNZIG. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused and released from the subpoena?

Mr. KUNZIG. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Call your next witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Zachary Schwartz.

Mr. CLARDY. The photographers will take their pictures before the witness starts testifying.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you stand and be sworn, Mr. Schwartz, please?

Mr. CLARDY. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I do.

I wonder if we could turn those lights off, please.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; but, first, let these gentlemen get their photographs.

Witness, as I understand, it is your request that the television lights be turned off?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That is correct.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you turn them off, gentlemen, please?

TESTIMONY OF ZACHARY SCHWARTZ

Mr. KUNZIG. Let the record show that Mr. Zachary Schwartz is represented, although not physically here today, personally, by Mr. Morris Ernst, distinguished New York counsel.

Mr. Ernst is unable to be here personally today, but in agreement with counsel, has, I understand, Mr. Schwartz, said you should go on alone—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Without his being here.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Schwartz, would you state your full name and address for the record?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Zachary Schwartz. My present address is 81 Pilgrim Avenue, Tuckahoe, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. How old are you, Mr. Schwartz?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I'm 40.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The usual public school and high school.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. In Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you graduate from high school?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I think it was 1930-31.

And then about 4 years of art school.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Would you, then, give the committee a résumé of your employment background, as much as you can remember, from the time you got out of art school?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, I worked for a short while for Warner Bros. Cartoon Studio, and then from there I went to the Walt Disney Studios, and then I was there for about 3 years, or so.

Then I worked for the Columbia Animated Studio in different screen jobs.

Mr. CLARDY. Keep your voice a little higher. It is difficult to hear.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I worked for the Columbia Animated Studio, known as Screen Gem Studio, and after that I was part owner of a studio, Animated Cartoon Studio, that has since then been fairly famous as UPA, United Productions of America.

After that—that was all in Hollywood—then, after that, I was a partner in a similar film-production company in New York known as Tempo Productions.

Since then I have free-lanced as an artist and designer of television advertising, and I have worked for the Biow Co., advertising agency, and at present I am working for the Sherman & Marquette Advertising Agency in New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. What type of work do you do, sir?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I design television advertising—television commercials.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I should like to ask you, Mr. Schwartz, and I do ask, whether at any time you have been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I was.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you tell the committee when you became a member and the factors which caused you to become a member?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I became a member of the Communist Party as near as I can recall, around 1940.

The factors that I feel were most important in my becoming a member of this organization go far back in my life.

I am a Jew and I was brought up in a community in Los Angeles which at that time was rather anti-Semitic in its attitudes. Certainly the section of the city I lived in many years—

Mr. DOYLE. What part is that?

I am from Los Angeles.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, that was out around Los Angeles High School. You remember there was an area there that was built up many years ago.

This was when I was a child. My parents were rather well off, and they liked to move around a good deal. We never owned our own home and, so, we lived in new areas, where most often we were the only Jewish family in the section, and I—

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Schwartz, excuse me. May I ask—I know it is difficult—that you keep your voice up and as loud as you can. It is so hard to hear in this room.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I will.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. So, each day I had to cope with the anti-Semitic attitudes of the kids who should have been my playmates; and, as we all know, for a child that's very destructive because, while adults can live with this kind of thing more easily, children must belong. They must feel themselves important and a necessary part of the community. It is a terribly destructive thing for a child to have thrown in his face, day after day, that he is a "kike" and a "sheenie."

Now, you gentlemen, I am sure, have never had to put up with anything like that. You are very fortunate, but it does exist.

Mr. CLARDY. It doesn't exist in the community where I live—and there are several of your faith who are my neighbors, and we have had no difficulty whatever, may I assure you.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, that is wonderful.

I don't think it exists to the extent today that it did exist at that time.

Mr. CLARDY. I think you are right.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we have got to admit it exists.

Mr. CLARDY. Some places.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Oh, yes; it does.

But I feel this original source of difficulty, in my own character development, my own personal problem with anti-Semitism, when I grew up was still there. The difficulty was still there and, to me, the Communist Party seemed to be the only organization putting up a—a fight against intolerance.

Now, I know now that this was incorrect, but at that time that was my feeling about it.

Mr. CLARDY. You didn't detect the sham at that time?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; I did not.

Shortly after getting in, however, I found something else that disturbed me greatly.

Mr. DOYLE. How old were you when you went in?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, that was 1940. So, it was—have to do some quick mathematics—I must have been about—

Mr. SCHERER. Thirteen years off your age.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That's right; so, that was 27.

And shortly after getting in I became aware of something that I had not realized before getting into the party, and that was the basically antidemocratic quality of the party itself—in other words, a kind of intolerance that was another kind of intolerance that I had to face, and it disturbed me greatly.

I can't say with certainty that I—that I got into the party as—at a definite period, or that I got out at a definite period. It was a kind of drifting in and out of this organization.

When I realized what it stood for and I became so disgusted with the demand on the part of the Communist Party that all members accept and agree to whatever was handed down from above, without any real observation or consideration, using their own intellects, to discover whether the concepts were good or bad, I felt that this was an evil thing; and, yet, I was not strong enough to withdraw because the other forces were still at work in me.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. SCHWARTZ (continuing). I have, for the last couple of years—I have been in psychoanalysis in an effort to straighten myself out, and a lot of these things have come out in the course of this treatment—other psychological forces as well—family relationships and things of that kind, that I think are at the base of the need that so many people have to join such an organization.

Mr. CLARDY. May I tell you, sir, that we have had a number of people of your intellectual capacity before us, and their explanation dovetails very neatly. It sound as though you had almost been in contact with these individuals—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Many of whom I know you do not know at all. The same experience—the same drifting in; the same drifting out—they have explained just about as you have.

Mr. SCHERER. For the same reasons.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. And the same discovery—there is no independence of action, of liberty to think. If you are a member of the Communist Party, you have to take dictation from above.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That is right; and that brought me face to face with a major conflict for me, because I am an artist.

Mr. SCHERER. Could I interrupt—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). At this point?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. In addition to this dictation from above, which we have been talking about, you have also found, like many of the other witnesses of your faith, who have been before us, that actually the Communist Party today is as anti-Semitic—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Definitely.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Almost as anti-Semitic as Hitler ever was?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Oh, yes; definitely.

Mr. SCHERER. You have come to that conclusion?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. There was—oh, there was something I had to—I had to see and fight against, and finally it was very important to me in getting out of the party—and that was: There was a latent anti-Semitism, even at that time, in the attitude of communism toward—toward—the Jewish movement in Israel—that there was very strong—

Mr. SCHERER. That has become apparent recently because the Russians are backing the Arabs.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Oh, much more apparent than it ever was.

Mr. SCHERER. Much more apparent?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. They are taking an anti-Semitic attitude in order to curry favor, perhaps with the Arabs—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). For the Arabian oil?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I don't think there's any question about it.

Mr. SCHERER. You think that is right?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I don't think there is any question about the use of anti-Semitism by Soviet policymakers as a tool—

Mr. CLARDY. You heard—

Mr. SCHWARTZ (continuing). For their own policies.

Mr. CLARDY. You heard the abortive effort a few minutes ago to drag the German bund into this hearing. Would you not agree today that they have been topped by the anti-Semitism of communism?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It's a little hard to top the Nazis.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I agree with you.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. There is a—

Mr. CLARDY. I agree.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It may come to that, but whether that is up to the present time, I can't say.

Mr. SCHERER. They are both equally bad in an American's eyes, aren't they?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I think——

Mr. SCHERER. I mean both——

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I think the objective is equally bad.

Mr. CLARDY. They should be condemned by all right-thinking Americans, shouldn't they?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Definitely; definitely, because I think the objective is an immoral one.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just along those lines, one question that appeals to me from my own past experience: If you were one of the millions of people who had been in a Nazi concentration camp or one of the millions today in a Russian concentration camp, would there be much difference as to which one you were in?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't think so?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Obviously not.

Mr. CLARDY. Or a Korean prisoner of war who has not yet been returned?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; obviously the difference in degree between each imprisonment is something one cannot measure.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Schwartz, as an artist, outstanding in the field in which you are working, I should like to ask you this question: Could you give the committee some estimate of your own viewpoint of Communist influence, first, on painting and, second, what influence communism has on motion pictures?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I think that in—in terms of painting, Communist policy or dogma has had relatively little importance in this country, primarily, I think, because painting is not a terribly important medium in our day, such as it was in earlier days.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean it doesn't seem to be?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; it doesn't seem to be. That is, there are very few people who are very much interested in painting as an art. I mean an average layman——

Mr. CLARDY. I have a brother who is an artist. So, I am bound to defend.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Painters are interested, but it is a pretty close community.

However, one can see the effects of Communist domination and Communist insistence of thinking along a certain groove or line in looking at a Russian painting, which I don't think any painter of any standard would deny is miserable, and has been for as long as I can remember.

Mr. CLARDY. I haven't been exposed to any of that yet.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, there isn't an awful lot of it you can see. There are some books published in which there are plates showing culture and painting, and it's very dull stuff; but, to my way of thinking, this is relatively unimportant because its area of influence is very small.

I think that in motion pictures which, in my opinion, is the modern mass art—the medium through which the greatest number of people can be reached—and while I have not seen in American pictures any Communist influence—that is, the Communist line shown in motion pictures in American theaters—still following the—following the logical direction that one must, taken over a long enough period of time, or established strongly as a governmental precept, these Communist policies, I feel, can—this philosophy can only bring sterility; and I think we can see that in Communist Russia, because the early motion pictures together, with closeups and long shots, and things of capable and analytical men and there are books, translated books, of writing by people like Poduffkin and Eisenstein, and particularly Poduffkin, who was one of the earliest writers on the subject, who had learned from D. W. Griffith and pays this compliment to an American director, an early director, who really evolved the methods of putting motion pictures together, with closeup and long shots, and things of that kind.

So, though they may claim to have invented baseball, they would have trouble substantiating that kind of claim in motion pictures because their own writers have indicated in early publications this was not true.

But over the years, after the period in which these very talented and creative men, with a certain degree of freedom in their work, were able to produce great films, films that were recognized as great all over the world, they're set in a period of—well, the only thing you call it is sterility; and today American—Russian motion pictures are far behind American. French, English motion pictures in terms of what they have to say and how they say it.

Mr. CLARDY. That is because of the compulsion to conform?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That is it.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. In our own country and in our own culture we mustn't underestimate, in my opinion, the importance of the individuality of each person; the creativeness that exists in each individual. That is the source of whatever greatness we have—whether it be industry, science, art; it doesn't matter. Each individual has something, in my opinion, to contribute, and when these contributions are forced into a given rut it—it must result in a killing of that creative ability, or certainly the loss of it for everyone else.

Mr. CLARDY. Which kills all progress, of course?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It kills all progress. It must result in that.

Mr. CLARDY. The secret of the American system is largely to be found in the antithesis of what you are saying?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That's right. It's to be found in the appreciation of the individual and his possible contribution to the welfare of the whole.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Schwartz, what years were you in the party?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I was in the party approximately—between 1940—let's see—I have some notes on that here.

Mr. KUNZIG. Refresh your recollection. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. 1940 to 1943—approximately.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder reentered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I want to ask you where the meetings were held that you attended?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The meetings that I recall were held at the home of an Edward Nolan.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell that?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. N-o-l-a-n, I believe, and——

Mr. KUNZIG. In what city?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. In Los Angeles.

Mr. KUNZIG. And——

Mr. SCHWARTZ. And they were small groups of people. Most of the people I don't even recall because over this period I don't imagine that, at the outside, I attended more than 12 meetings. I would go and become irritated by the indoctrination and demands of the party, and then I would leave; and then they would put the heat on me. I'd come back again, pay dues, when demanded. It never amounted to much.

But it was an ineffectual group. I don't think there was any more—anything more there than a lot of talk. As far as any sabotage, or anything of that kind, there was never a smell of anything like that.

Mr. KUNZIG. At least you didn't know of anything of that nature?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Nothing of that kind I was ever aware of.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Edward Biberman——

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. B-i-b-e-r-m-a-n?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I believe that is how he spells it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, I concluded he was because one of the last meetings I attended—not a meeting—it was a lecture on art, given by Biberman, and a long period of time had elapsed between the previous meeting—oh, I would say 2 years, anyway, between the previous meeting and this art lecture; but he was the lecturer, and the subject of the lecture, as closely as I can remember, was Marxism and art.

Mr. KUNZIG. Marxism and art?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. And art; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, was this meeting you are talking about, where this lecture on art was given, the last meeting you attended?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; it was. I was completely disgusted with the whole thing at that point. I had a——

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain——

Mr. SCHWARTZ (continuing). Feeling of disgust.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Why the lecture disgusted you, and what you did at the lecture?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, the lecture disgusted me because it brought me face to face with a thing I had—something I had known for a long time, but never quite come to loggerheads with before, and that was the demand that I accept ideas that I felt were utterly ridiculous, and that I paint that way or draw that way or think that way as an artist was impossible; and I got into a discussion with the lecturer around the whole idea of what he called the utilitarian aspects of art, and my argument with him was that art in any form—whether it be painting, writing, music—anything creative—anything of a cre-

ative effort is a thing of the spirit and you can't control it or handle it the way you would a frying pan and the manufacture of a piece of utilitarian material of that kind.

So, we had quite a discussion about that, and I got rather hot under the collar and I left; and I have never been in any meeting, any Communist meeting, or anything of that kind, since.

Mr. KUNZIG. Since that time?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. And what year was that?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That was, I believe, 1945.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, this Ed Biberman, whom we just mentioned—did you know him to be the man who did the murals on the post office in Los Angeles?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; I did not. I had never even seen those murals. I knew him to be a teacher of art in Los Angeles, and our relationship was—well, there was no relationship actually until the day he come over to ask me if I would attend this lecture.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean in San Francisco, don't you—the murals at the post office in San Francisco?

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe the investigation showed Los Angeles.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, there are some in both places, and there is quite a to-do about the one in San Francisco.

I didn't know whether you were referring to that one or not.

Mr. FUOSS. The investigator in Los Angeles said it was in Los Angeles.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, it is unimportant.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Bernyce Fleury as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. F-l-e-u-r-y?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; her maiden name was Bernyce Polifka.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was that name?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Polifka.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, would you spell it, please?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. P-o-l-i-f-k-a, I believe.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did she attend the meetings you attended?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Some of them; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you will recall the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. The committee of the Writers Congress coming forth from that Hollywood Writers' Mobilization lists Zachary Schwartz as a member of the general committee and Zachary Schwartz as head of the animated cartoon section, clerk of that section.

Are you that Zachary Schwartz?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were part of that group?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I was.

I was—I think I can say this without being unduly egotistical—I was a leading member of my craft in the animated cartoon business, and it was natural I accept the chairmanship of this seminar that was held on the subject.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, this Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, for the record, was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947, again in 1948, and it was cited as a Communist-front organization whose true purpose was the creation of a clearing-house for Communist propaganda by the California Committee on Un-American Activities as early as 1945.

I would like to ask one more question concerning a statement previously made by this witness.

When you came to New York in 1946, Mr. Schwartz, was an effort made to involve you again in the Communist Party here?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; there was one effort.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain how that was done?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, it was sort of cloak-and-daggerish.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I received a telephone call, and the party calling me did not give a name but said my name had been passed on to them from California, and from the club. Well, I guessed what they were talking about, because I didn't belong to any clubs out there, and I told them on the phone, whoever it was, that I was not interested and not to bother me with the thing—and that was that. I had nothing to do with them.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. As an example and a fine illustration of how names stay on things unless specifically taken off, the Hollywood Quarterly of April 1947, No. 3, volume 2, 1947, you will note, lists a Zachary Schwartz as a member of the advisory committee.

Are you that Zachary Schwartz?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, I am Zachary Schwartz, but I was in New York at the time; and certainly I didn't even know my name was on that publication.

It must have been held over from a time that I was a chairman of that seminar.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you didn't give your name in 1947?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; definitely not.

Mr. KUNZIG. This Hollywood Quarterly is a publication cited as a Communist project sponsored jointly by the Communist front, the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and the University of California at Los Angeles. The first issue appeared in October 1945.

It was so cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in their 1948 report.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you acquainted with any other Zachary Schwartz?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. DOYLE. In your line or profession?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. DOYLE. In your experience?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. DOYLE. In Hollywood or Los Angeles?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Doyle, do you have some?

Mr. DOYLE. I do have.

I think it is very important that we ask this witness two or three questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Will it take very long?

As you know, we have got to adjourn at 11:30 because the chairman is being honored by a luncheon of the American Jewish League Against Communism, Chairman Velde, so there will be no confusion—and we are all invited to attend.

And I had better ask counsel a question about this.

You have another witness ready to take the stand, as I understand?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir. Mr. Tavenner has another witness ready to take the stand—I believe quite an important witness.

Mr. DOYLE. This afternoon?

Mr. KUNZIG. He will be ready immediately.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I am trying to discover whether Mr. Doyle may finish before 11:30 so we may make this luncheon honoring Chairman Velde, or whether we should desist and come back after lunch and start with this other witness.

What is your preference?

Mr. DOYLE. If the chairman will let me begin, I will help you get out of here by 11:30.

Mr. CLARDY. You think you can?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. All right; we will do it whichever way we can do it best.

Mr. DOYLE. Under Public Law 601 this committee is assigned, Mr. Schwartz, as you know, to report back to Congress any recommendations we may have based on our nation-wide hearings and investigation in subversive activities, in the field of legislation.

Have you any suggestions to this committee?

Have you given it thought?

Making such a study and making such reports back to Congress is the paramount justification of this committee, I think.

Mr. SCHWARTZ (continuing). No; offhand, I don't.

Mr. DOYLE. All right, if you haven't thought of that, will you give it some thought, please—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And transmit your recommendations to us—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Certainly.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Because we really want them?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Certainly.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, because you have identified yourself as a Jew—if you hadn't, I wouldn't have done it, certainly, in this question; but because you have and, therefore, have put yourself in the so-called minority groups—although, to me, of course, there is no minority group in America; it is all one—but, you having done so, for the purposes of your explanation, what is your thought; have you any helpful thinking to this committee as to why allegedly and maybe practically there are so many members of minority groups who go into communism? Why do they do it?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, I think—

Mr. DOYLE. Now, in asking you this question, sir, I believe it is basic in our study; but I am not picking on any minority or particular group.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I understand that.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't mean inferentially so, but it just seems so. Why do they do it?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, I think they are affected by a sense of—of not belonging as an important and desired part of the community.

I think that is terribly important.

There are all kinds of forces at work in all of us—conscious and unconscious forces.

Mr. DOYLE. What makes—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. A lot—

Mr. DOYLE. What makes them have that sense of not belonging?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I think—

Mr. DOYLE. Are they born with it?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. DOYLE. What is it?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I think it is a thing that exists in our country today, which is a kind of inheritance that we are all hoping to eliminate with time—that all of us do not accept upon equal terms other groups, social or religious; and, of course, until this does come about there will always be the possibility of appealing to people who feel that they are shut out, that they are not wanted, that they are not important and necessary members of the community, and then they look for an area in which they can be important, which they can hope to change things, so they are closer to their own heart's desire; but, of course, they leave—they become, then, an easy kind of mark for any successful group, any group that can successfully convince them.

Mr. CLARDY. Any demagogic appeal, in other words.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes—that can convince them that lending their aid and support to this group or individual can gain this end.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask you this question—and I have 2 minutes left.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I will make it quick.

Mr. DOYLE. What, then, as a counter program, if any, in your judgment, is there or should there be to try to counter the false premise?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I think that we must counter it in the organizations, in the established, honored organizations and institutions, of our country—the churches, the clubs, the cultural clubs—those organizations that have as their objective a constructive end.

In those organizations children can be talked to, can be taught to accept each other upon their own face values, as individuals, worthwhile individuals.

Mr. CLARDY. We must have tolerance taught in an effective way?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That's right, and it isn't intolerance, you know.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It is utter and complete acceptance of one human being by another.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, there must be a positive premise?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That's right, and—

Mr. DOYLE. Rather than—

Mr. SCHWARTZ (continuing). An affirmation.

Mr. DOYLE. Rather than just a tolerant or negative basis?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, one other question: Have your rights been infringed upon before this committee today?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; I don't think so.

Mr. DOYLE. Don't you resent being subpoenaed and coming here before this committee?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; I think I may have done some good.

Mr. DOYLE. I have never met you in my life that I know of.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. DOYLE. So I am taking a chance as to what your answers are.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Why didn't you plead your constitutional privileges and rights?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, I had repudiated everything that the Communist Party stood for long ago.

Mr. CLARDY. You had purged your soul of all of those sort of things, hadn't you?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I had.

Mr. DOYLE. I know, but you put yourself in the minds of some people, even some who are here in this room today—I see a few of them still here again today—who will call you a stoolpigeon and an informer.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Well, that's their problem and not mine.

Mr. DOYLE. That's their problem?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I believe that to be true.

I maintain my right to my own opinion, arrived at freely; and if I have arrived at it in opposition to those of other people, possibly people with whom I may have had a community of agreement at some time, that is my right.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, let me compliment you, sir, and I want to say this: There are still some people in this room that I see, and I wish they would have a reconsideration of their position taken before this committee and come on and help us as this gentleman has.

I give you that invitation—some of you who are still here in this room today.

Thank you very much.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Witness, may I, on behalf of the entire committee, express our deep appreciation and thanks for the contribution that we think you have so effectively made to the work of this committee and, as we have told other witnesses who have exposed to us the inner workings of the Communist conspiracy against this Nation—indeed, against all free peoples everywhere—may I say this to you, and through you to your employers, whoever they may be: That this committee believes that in the rendition of this service to this committee, to this Congress, you have been doing something for your country that should be recognized; and the committee, as it has in other instances, hopes and prays that there will be no economic sanctions of any kind visited upon you, because they will be ill-deserved if they are.

May I say, further, that I think you have given a most articulate expression of the reasons why some people drift in and drift out it has been my privilege to hear.

I thank you very, very much.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Thank you.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, the committee will stand in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 11:33 a. m., the hearings was recessed to reconvene at 2:30 p. m., of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 2:35 p. m., of the same day, the hearing was resumed, the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman, appearance noted in transcript), Bernard W. Kearney (appearance noted in transcript), Kit Clardy (presiding), Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder (appearance noted in transcript), Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance noted in transcript).)

Mr. CLARDY (presiding). The committee will be in order.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Call your first witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Robert Rossen.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ROSSEN. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. Be seated.

Mr. ROSSEN. Thank you.

Mr. CLARDY. We will get the still camera ordeal over with first. That is a familiar story to you, almost as much as it is to us.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT ROSSEN

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what is your name?

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. Reporter, let the record show a subcommittee consisting of Congressman Scherer, Congressman Doyle, and myself has been set up for this afternoon's session. Other members may arrive, at which time I ask you to record their joining the subcommittee.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. ROSSEN. Robert Rossen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your name, please?

Mr. ROSSEN. R-o-s-s-e-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen, are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; I'm not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are familiar with the practice of the committee, are you not, that every witness is encouraged and permitted to have counsel with him, if he desires?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. And also has the privilege of consulting counsel at any time he may so desire?

Mr. ROSSEN. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen—

Mr. CLARDY. I think we should ask: It is at your own election you are appearing unescorted, so to speak?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen, you appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1951, under a subpoena, did you not?

Mr. ROSSEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time you were very frank and dignified in the replies to the questions that were propounded to you, but you very firmly relied upon the immunity given by the fifth amendment—

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). To the Constitution, and you refused to answer many questions that were asked, although you did at the time deny that you were then a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. What was the date of that hearing, Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. June 25, 1951.

I think I should point out at the close of the witness' testimony at that time a member of the committee had this to say:

Mr. Rossen, I am very sorry that you have seen fit not to cooperate fully with the committee. I acknowledge the legality of your definition of cooperation, up to the point where your constitutional rights are involved; but I feel, personally, that we are engaged in a mortal struggle, in which one philosophy or the other is going to be victorious.

I also feel that you have in your possession information which would be of inestimable value not only to this committee, but to the entire country and every citizen of this country.

I hope that you will, as the weeks go by—I hope it very sincerely—see your way clear to come in before this committee, not in the role of an informer, but in the role of a loyal American citizen, and in line with the statement that you, yourself, made before this committee, because I believe that your testimony today is inconsistent with your profession of loyalty.

I hope that it will come to pass that the committee can have you back at a future date when you will go all-out in an effort to do your part toward whipping this thing we are up against.

And during the course of the testimony, when you were extended by counsel an invitation to come back, if you changed your mind, with regard to the fifth amendment, you replied that if you changed your mind you would get in touch with the committee.

Mr. ROSSEN. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you change your mind?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did you get in touch with the committee?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I did.

(Representatives Morgan M. Moulder and James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. So, your appearance here today is the result of your voluntary decision to reappear before the committee and answer such questions as may be asked?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's quite correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee may like to know why you have changed your mind about that.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, arriving at a decision like this takes a long time. I'd like to sort of compare it to arriving at a decision to leaving the Communist Party. That takes a long time. It never has anything to do with any actual date. It usually is a long process of time. To arrive at the decision which makes me come here today took me several years.

As you've pointed out, I was here in—before the committee in 1951. The decision that I arrived at in 1951 was an individual decision. I wasn't a member of the Communist Party at the time, as I stated. I felt that the position I had taken at the time was a position of what I considered to be individual morality. It was a matter between me and my own conscience. I wasn't influenced by anyone, nor is this decision that I take here today influenced by anyone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little?

Mr. ROSSEN. I'm sorry. I'm not an actor.

I did a lot of thinking. I don't think, after 2 years of thinking, that any one individual can even indulge himself in the luxury of individual morality or pit it against what I feel today very strongly is the security and safety of this Nation.

This is a government, a democracy, of laws and not of men; and the law says that this Congress or this committee of this Congress has a right to inquire into matters affecting the security of this United States of America.

It's my duty and my right to appear here today, after much thinking, and give you whatever information I have. It is not my right to judge as to whether or not that information has any value. This is in your hands.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, I will proceed to ask some of the questions which were asked before, but not necessarily in the same way.

Mr. ROSSEN. All right, sir.

May I refer to some notes—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. You may.

Mr. ROSSEN. If I may?

Mr. CLARDY. You may, Witness.

Mr. ROSSEN. Thank you.

Mr. CLARDY. If it will help you in your recollection, you may do so.

Mr. ROSSEN. It is a long recollection.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; I imagine so.

Mr. TAVENNER. As some of the present members of the committee were not members of the committee at the time you appeared before it, there are some things I would like for you to restate.

When and where were you born?

Mr. ROSSEN. I was born in New York City on March 16, 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I have—I'm a producer, a director, and a writer of motion pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you also been a playwright?

Mr. ROSSEN. A great many years ago—not a successful one, but I wrote for the theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, some background of your experience in those fields—that is, as a playwright, as a screenwriter, as a director, and as a producer?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I started working in the New York theater about—I'd say about—1930. I wrote one play which was produced. I directed several, and went through the various jobs that one goes through in terms of the theater in order to achieve some kind of recognition; but the main bulk of my work is in Hollywood, actually.

I went to Hollywood in 1936 as a screenwriter. I was under contract to Warner Bros. and stayed there for about seven and a half years.

I then—what is known to the industry as—freelanced and worked for various organizations like Hal Wallis Productions, Enterprise, United Artists, and Columbia Pictures.

About 1936 I started to direct, and in—no; 1946—I'm sorry—I started to direct—and in 1947 I became—I organized my own company and released through Columbia Pictures, which I was doing up to the time of that fatal day of June 25, 1951.

And that about in terms of—that about sums up my life in Hollywood—the work I've done in Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you tell the committee, please, what some of the principal productions have been for which you have received credit as a screenwriter?

Mr. ROSSEN. At Warner Bros. I wrote such films as *Marked Woman*, *They Won't Forget*, *The Sea Wolf*, *Edge of Darkness*, *The Roaring Twenties*.

When I left Warner's—I'm sort of highlighting this—when I left Warner's, I wrote *A Walk in the Sun*, *Strange Love of Martha Ivers*—I directed one—two—*Johnny O'Clock*, *Body and Soul*, *All the King's Men*, and *The Brave Bulls*. I produced *All the King's Men*, *The Brave Bulls*, and a picture called *Undercover Man*.

That would sort of highlight my career.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has consisted of?

Mr. ROSSEN. I went to public schools in New York, high school, and I spent two and a half years at New York University.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time were you a member of the party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, without trying to pinpoint the exact dates, I would say from about 1937 to 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what the circumstances were under which you united with the Communist Party or, in other words, why you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. I'll try.

I've done a lot of thinking about this, and it seems to me, in addition to the usual reasons which have been presented before this committee, instead of going back to the thirties, I sort of went back to the twenties, and I kept thinking of the intellectual atmosphere in which we lived at that time as young men—the fact that there was a period of great cynicism, disillusionment; it was a period in which I think most young men who were interested in ideas accepted the premise that the system of government or this Government that we had grown up under had failed—there was no—there weren't any more horizons; there weren't any more promises; we had pretty much reached the apex of a pretty materialistic society.

Then the thirties, of course, and the depression proved—at least to any man with ideas—that this was true; the system had, in a sense,

broken down for us in terms of our own personal experience, and we felt that we were looking—I felt that I was looking—for new horizons, a new kind of society, something I could believe in and become a part of, something in—well, in a sense I felt I wanted to attach myself to history; I wanted to be a part of that historical movement, and it seemed to me at the time the Communist Party offered, as far as I was concerned, the only way which that could be effective.

You had the rise of fascism in the thirties. You had struggle against the depression. You had the most vital movement in terms of writers, artists, et cetera, that existed. You felt that something new had to grow up, had to grow out of all of this, and you felt that the Communist Party was the medium through which this could be effected.

This was, in a sense—it offered every possible kind of thing to you at that time which could fulfill your sense of idealism, and it was a kind of dedication. People in the Communist Party felt they were doing this not for any particular and immediate gain, but out of a real sense of self-sacrifice; and it was a catchall in the sense for idealism, and you went into it completely.

MR. SCHERER. Was it because of this cynicism and the thing that you were looking for couldn't be found in any of the religions?

MR. ROSSEN. Well, we didn't have a very religious movement in this country in the twenties and thirties, did we?

One didn't really go toward religion in those days.

MR. SCHERER. That is the reason I asked the question.

MR. DOYLE. They don't very often go toward it now, do they?

MR. CLARDY. Isn't that one of the reasons why we are afflicted as we are today, because there is not that drive that should come from the inner man to lead us into religion?

MR. ROSSEN. Well, I don't know. I think you can find it in many different ways, and certainly anything that tends toward the realization of the inner man, on any level—whether it be the kind of—any level—is a good thing; but certainly in the days that I can remember I think most of the intellectual life of the country was, in a sense, antireligious, or atheist.

MR. SCHERER. That is the reason I said the cynicism of which you spoke.

MR. ROSSEN. Well, values had broken down. This is a real fact. There weren't any values, and the Communist Party seemed to be at a place that had the values. Its people were the most dedicated. It worked the hardest, and it was interested in cultural movements. It was interested in anything you were interested in. Therefore, you felt this was the only place you could possibly go.

I would say on that level that was the reason—in other words, the same reason that you joined the party, as I believed, ultimately is the same reason you got out of it.

MR. DOYLE. I didn't hear that.

MR. CLARDY. You discovered the deception?

MR. ROSSEN. Well, the apparatus is not the apparatus for what you believe in.

In other words, Mr. Doyle, what I said was—I said the same reasons why you go into the party are the same reasons which make you go out, which is ultimately the discovery that the idealism that you

were looking for, the fighting for the ideas that you want, are just not in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You find——

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you don't——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Other sinister motives and purposes that you had not discovered to begin with?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, you discover none of the things that you believe in, in a sense, were being fought for in terms of that ideal itself. They were merely being instruments for an end in itself.

Mr. CLARDY. Just using them in a cynical fashion to bring converts into the party?

Mr. ROSSEN. I would think so; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't want to interrupt the magnificent trend of this thinking, but you say the ideals that brought you into the party were being used for an end.

Mr. ROSSEN. The end being the organization of the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, that is what I am getting at.

Mr. ROSSEN. Of course, the recruiting of people—well, for a great many reasons.

Mr. DOYLE. And does that mean, then, if I am not anticipating, that you found that the idealism which drove you into the Communist Party, or attracted you into the Communist Party, did not embrace the ideals, in fact, of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's correct, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, they were not practicing what they were preaching?

Mr. ROSSEN. It took a long time to find it out.

Mr. CLARDY. You discovered they were very materialistic and very antireligious, and did not have the liberal concept or content that you thought it had?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I would say no; I would have to rule one of those things out——

Mr. CLARDY. Which is that?

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). Which is the question of antireligion. I mean, when you went into the party, the party always stood very openly for a—against religion.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you mean on that score, then?

Mr. ROSSEN. I mean——

Mr. CLARDY. So, the converts——

Mr. ROSSEN. I would have to rule that out, in my own——

Mr. CLARDY. You don't mean to rule it out—you mean most of those who went in to start with were not inclined to be very religious——

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And, therefore, thought nothing of that point?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's correct, because religion——

Mr. CLARDY. You discovered, as you went along, however, that was one vital essential, though, didn't you?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, certainly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any experience in your work, which I understood at the beginning to be that of a playwright, which had

any bearing upon your entering into the party, in addition to the things you have just described to us?

MR. ROSSEN. I don't—I really don't quite follow you, Mr. Tavenner. Experience in what sense?

MR. TAVENNER. Well, I had in mind your own experience in the theater whether or not efforts came to your attention of a disagreement with your work by Communist Party members which left any impression upon you and might have influenced you to some extent—

MR. ROSSEN. No; not that I—

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). Through criticism of your work.

MR. ROSSEN. No; not that I can remember.

I had—I—I had no party contacts in New York City at all that I can remember; and, as a matter of fact, I was pretty far away from it at that time.

My only recollection is what I read in the press, but that didn't have any relation to me personally.

MR. TAVENNER. Then, as I understand, you became susceptible to the Communist Party prior to 1937. When did you actually become a member of the party?

MR. ROSSEN. Well, if I can recall, I think it was sometime in the early part of 1937.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that after you had gone to California?

MR. ROSSEN. Yes; it was about—somewhere within a year from the date I went to California; somewhere within that year. I came to California in the middle of 1936, and in—if recollection serves me, I joined the party, I would say, about the spring or summer of '37. I'm not quite sure, but it's somewhere within that area.

Well, in Hollywood, particularly—again, you have to look at the background of what was going on at that time. You had a great trade-union fight that was going on in relation to the Screen Writers' Guild in 1936.

There was—there had been set up by the producers at that time an organization called the Screen Playwrights. The Screen Writers' Guild at that time felt this was a competent union and that a fight should be made.

The most active people in that fight—it was highly organized and most effective—were people that subsequently I found out to be members of the Communist Party—as a matter of fact, I—I really think, in retrospect, the most capable; and, naturally, I was drawn toward these people, both from the point of view of their dedication to what they were doing and from the point of view of their prestige and their standing as screenwriters; and when I was approached somewhere in the spring of 1937 to join the party, I must say that I was not bashful at all. I was very eager to join the Communist Party in 1937.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you go through any course of preparation or training before actually being asked to become a member of the party?

MR. ROSSEN. Yes; there were Marxist study groups—two steps before you got into the party: There was a Marxist study group, and then after you went through that, which must have lasted—not very long—I imagine about 2 or 3 months—you then went to a new members' class, and you then became a member of the party. Those were

the—I think that period must have taken about—oh, no more than about 4 or 5 months altogether.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was it that solicited your membership in the party?

Mr. ROSSEN. A man called Michael Uris.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his position in Hollywood, or his profession?

Mr. ROSSEN. He was a screenwriter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell his name, please?

Mr. ROSSEN. U-r-i-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. Michael Uris?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. Is this a good juncture for our brief recess?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Chairman Velde has arrived.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. We will recess for 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 3 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 3:05 p. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 3:10 p. m., the following committee members being present. Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show at this point present are Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde.

Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that the first step you took in getting into the party in Hollywood was to attend Marxist classes?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the instructor of the class?

Mr. ROSSEN. Dr. Leo Bigelman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Leo Bigelman.

Would you spell the last name?

Mr. ROSSEN. B-i-g-e-l-m-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, testimony has been introduced through a number of witnesses identifying Dr. Bigelman as a member of the party.

Did you later learn he was a member of the party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. He appeared as a witness, but refused to testify.

Mr. VELDE. Claiming the fifth amendment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Claiming the fifth amendment.

The evidence was introduced that he was a member of a professional cell of the Communist Party composed solely of members of the medical profession.

After you completed your work in the study group and then in the training, early training, class for members of the Communist Party, were you assigned to any special group of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes. At that time groups were, as I remember them, sort of divided up into geographic units. In other words, you went to the unit or branch near which you lived—made it easy for you to

get to—and I don't know the name or designation of the first branch, but I can remember the general area and some of the people.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of that particular branch or cell of the party?

Mr. ROSSEN. About—somewhere around a year. I would say about a year, until I moved out of that area and went to another area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what, in general, was the type of membership that made up that group?

Mr. ROSSEN. People who worked in motion pictures—that is—and their wives—that is, creative people, people who, in that particular branch, as I remember—and I don't remember too many of the people—but mostly writers, and I think one director was in it; but the cells or branches, whatever you call them, would pretty much fall into, aside from its geographic structure—would pretty much fall into a craft structure. In other words, writers would generally go together with writers, and directors, et cetera.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, during the period you were a member of these two groups, were you visited by functionaries of the party who lectured or otherwise instructed the membership?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Not in the first group; not in the Marxist study group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. I can't remember that, but when I went into a new members' class, I can remember functionaries—well, I—I'm not sure about one of them, but Madelaine Ruthven, who was an organizer of the Communist Party in Hollywood—I think a paid functionary—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell—

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). The last name, please?

Mr. ROSSEN. R-u-t-h-v-e-n.

And I can remember Lawson came around.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who?

Mr. ROSSEN. John Howard Lawson.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Howard Lawson.

Mr. ROSSEN. And I think Lou Harris visited that group—H-a-r-r-i-s.

I think the only one of those people who I mentioned were actually paid functionaries was Madelaine Ruthven or—I don't know whether she was paid or not—whether or not they paid her.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, during the period of your membership, were you required to pay dues?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; there was—as a matter of fact, that was one of the functions of a new members' class. You not only got instruction in terms of the organizational structure of the party, but also the question of dues.

It was divided into dues and assessments—that is, I think the basic dues were a dollar a month, but in terms of Hollywood you were assessed a percentage of your salary, and if I remember correctly it was about 5 percent, less whatever you paid your agent.

Mr. CLARDY. Less what?

Mr. ROSSEN. Whatever you paid your agent.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh.

Mr. ROSSEN. In other words, that would come out of the net salary that you made.

Mr. TAVENNER. It would be a percentage of your net salary?

Mr. ROSSEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did that apply to the writers generally—

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Who were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. That applied to the Hollywood—in my own experience, that applied to the Hollywood section of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. What percentage did you say that was?

Mr. ROSSEN. Five.

Mr. SCHERER. Five percent?

Mr. ROSSEN. Five percent.

Mr. SCHERER. Of your salary?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. MOULDER. Five percent each month?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. That would amount to very large sums of money over a given period, if there were very many in it; wouldn't it?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; it would.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen—

Mr. CLARDY. Does he have some knowledge of that?

Mr. TAVENNER. He does, as I understand.

Mr. CLARDY. I wonder if he had on a general scale.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask him.

How much did you contribute by way of assessments to the Communist Party, as well as you can recall?

Mr. ROSSEN. I've tried to sort of compute it. I just can't be accurate, but I would say, over a period of 10 years, in terms of direct contributions to the Communist Party, Peoples' World drives, contributions to the New Masses—I'd say about \$20,000.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period—

Mr. FRAZIER. During a period of 10 years?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

That would not include amounts of money I had given to organizations outside.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would not include your contributions to Communist-front organizations?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I didn't know they—you know, I—I mean, it would not include contributions to Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee or political campaigns, and so forth.

I would say that would pretty well sum up—come pretty close to what I contributed almost directly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Directly to the party?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you any idea what your total contribution, then, would be to the Communist cause or Communist-front organizations?

Mr. ROSSEN. That would be awfully hard to tell, in going back.

Mr. SCHERER. I know it would be hard, but have you got some idea?

I would be interested in knowing that.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I—I say—I could say pretty safely I think you could double it easily.

Mr. SCHERER. Double it?

Mr. ROSSEN. I think you could double that sum, 20 and get another 20.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, how, in your judgment, did your contributions compare with that made by other principal screenwriters who were members of the Communist Party?

MR. ROSSEN. I don't think there were very many people in the Communist Party, in my own knowledge, who gave that amount because they—you know, there weren't very many people who made that kind of money, that they could give it. I wouldn't say—my own recollection—there were more than maybe 10 throughout Hollywood who could give that kind of money.

MR. CLARDY. Now, you are talking about in your own professional class?

MR. ROSSEN. Yes.

MR. CLARDY. Not in the actor group?

MR. ROSSEN. No; no. I wouldn't know very much about them at all.

MR. SCHERER. But it would be 5 percent?

MR. ROSSEN. Yes.

MR. SCHERER. That was a general practice?

MR. ROSSEN. That's right.

MR. SCHERER. It would be 5 percent of their net income?

MR. ROSSEN. The reason I can't go into what the rest of it is—that would then come down—I don't think very many of them were in for 10 years. So, you naturally would have to come down with that total.

MR. SCHERER. We would have to consider it on a percentage basis.

MR. ROSSEN. But that was—sometimes it varied. We would have discussions about it. It would go to 4 sometimes; sometimes go up to 5, and then 4 when people felt they were paying too much. But it would always be within that area. I never remember it varying between 4 and 5.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Max Silver, who was executive secretary of the Communist Party for Los Angeles County, has testified that the large contributions or assessments that were made in this area did not pass through the county organization. Do you have any knowledge of how the funds were handled?

MR. ROSSEN. I have no direct knowledge, Mr. Tavenner. I can only recall conversations on the subject, and it's my impression there always was—my recollection, rather—that there always was a kind of—the county and section were at odds as to whether or not the county was getting its proper share of the money. The recollection that I have is that the bulk of the money collected in Hollywood went pretty directly to the national committee in New York.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know for what purpose the national committee used the funds raised in Hollywood?

MR. ROSSEN. I can only surmise that. I could have no direct knowledge of it.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, do you have any basis?

MR. ROSSEN. I can only say, surmise, it would be in terms of party press; it would be in terms of paid organizers.

I think that generally that an awful lot of money went into publication and party press, et cetera, but I would have no direct knowledge of knowing exactly what they did with the money, nor how it got there.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you recall any special appeals from the national headquarters to the Communist members in Hollywood for the purpose of financing projects of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Gee, there were so many special appeals it's hard for me to recall, but the things that always keep—that keep—that are most vivid in my memory always seem to be connected with the party press—the fact that the New Masses or the Daily Worker or the Peoples' World could not meet its printing bill or was about to go under, and an appeal would come to you, saying, "Will you contribute that amount of money so we can keep the party press going?"

Mr. CLARDY. It was always just on the verge of folding unless somebody contributed?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. SCHERER. At least that is what the representation was that was made?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you have told us of having been transferred from one group to another group in the Communist Party. That would bring you up to about what date, do you think, the time that you were—

Mr. ROSSEN. Some time around 1939, I would say.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1939.

Mr. ROSSEN. I am trying to recall in terms of places I lived in, and I remember I had—I moved from Hollywood to Beverly Hills in about 1939, which would mean I would have gone into another group at that time. So, somewhere around 1939, I would say, is a pretty correct estimate of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, in 1939 there occurred an event which seemed to have had considerable effect upon members of the Communist Party.

You have stated that one of your reasons for going into the Communist Party was the rise of fascism in Europe.

Now, on August 23, 1939, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany entered into a pact which had very wide ramifications and a great impact upon people throughout the world.

Mr. ROSSEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you were opposed to fascism in Europe, as the Communists professed to be, was there any difficulty within your party group upon learning that—that there had been this pact between Soviet Russia and Hitlerite Germany?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, there was great consternation, as I can remember, throughout Hollywood, which was the direct contact I had. As a matter of fact, I think a great many people must have dropped out at that time.

The effort to explain it, in a way, was very strenuous, and people who were either on the functionary level, who were Communists for a great many years, spent a lot of time explaining it.

It was always necessary at that time to get a rationale. In other words, practically my whole life in the party, as I reflect upon it, is a series of rationales.

One of the rationales that was given to me—that doesn't imply that you didn't look for it yourself, but one of the rationales was: You weren't a good Marxist. Therefore, you didn't understand it; and if you had been a good Marxist and had really understood Marxism, Leninism, et cetera, you would have understood the necessity for the pact.

My own particular case—I needed more rationale than that, and I must say I wanted a rationale. I wanted a reason. I wanted a reason because one doesn't throw over very easy what one has gone into and believed in.

I got the rationale at that time that the important part of the Nazi-Soviet pact, to me, personally, was the fact, that, in my opinion, it saved over a million Jews from being destroyed by Hitler.

As you remember, when the Nazis marched into Poland, the Red Army marched to a particular area. My own background was such—my people came from that area—that I knew how many Jews there were there. I was very interested. I knew that these Jews would be destroyed, as subsequently proven, and my feeling was that that was an act of saving that number of Jews from possible destruction.

Subsequently I've done some research, in trying to find out whether or not I was alone in that.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, just a moment, to be certain we are clear about that. There was no question in your mind as to what would happen to the Jews who were in the wake of the Nazi army?

MR. ROSSEN. None whatever.

MR. TAVENNER. You attempted to rationalize the situation by attempting to conclude that those Jews who were in the area which was occupied by the Russian Army would not receive the same treatment—

MR. ROSSEN. That's correct.

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). As those in the German Army path?

MR. ROSSEN. That's right. That is exactly the way I felt at that time.

MR. TAVENNER. Well—

MR. ROSSEN. Shall I continue?

MR. SCHERER. Well, you—

MR. TAVENNER. Excuse me.

MR. SCHERER. All right.

MR. TAVENNER. I am interested to know to what extent the Communist Party endeavored to utilize that view in holding persons in the Communist Party who were of the Jewish race.

MR. ROSSEN. Well, in Hollywood at that time I don't think it was used to any great extent. That is, in terms of Hollywood—but I don't think the Jewish question was ever very seriously discussed at that time.

Now, I go back now to 1939. I did discuss this with, oh, four or five people at the time and we all reached that conclusion.

Subsequently I wanted to find out whether or not I had reached this independently or whether or not the party, as such, had used this as a means of holding people; and some research I have here, for whatever it is worth, bears that theory out; and if you want to hear with me—

MR. SCHERER. That is what I want.

MR. ROSSEN (continuing). I can read some of it.

MR. SCHERER. That is what I would like.

MR. ROSSEN. This is from the Worker of September 18, 1939.

MR. DOYLE. What Worker is that?

MR. ROSSEN. Daily Worker.

MR. DOYLE. The Communist Party—

MR. ROSSEN. That is the Communist press; yes.

It is an editorial entitled "For National Freedom and World Peace."

MR. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you there a moment. Do you recall how soon the German Army and the Russian Army began their marches into Poland after the completion of the pact between Russia and Germany?

MR. ROSSEN. I don't recall the exact date, but I don't think it took more than a week. As I can recall, the Nazi-Soviet pact was signed the last week in August—somewhere around August 23—and I think the Germans invaded Poland around September 1. So, the Red Army move must have come either the same day or a day later, and all of these events happened with great rapidity. I mean just before you even had a chance to think, there they were.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, then—

MR. ROSSEN. I would say that would be the date pretty much.

Now, obviously there must have been a lot of discussion throughout the party on this, and this is not—I'll quote here—this editorial is headed "For National Freedom and World Peace":

As Hitler's hordes advanced further into Poland, the atrocities against the Jewish people and other minorities exceeded some of fascism's goriest deeds.

In this situation, the Soviet Government sent in the Red Army, an army of liberation, to protect the Ukrainian and White Russian minorities, after the semi-Fascist Polish Government had ceased to exist and had left them to the ravages of war and Fascist enslavement.

More than a million Jews living in western Ukraine and western Byelo-Russia are now beyond the pale of Fascist anti-Semitism.

There is another article—I think that is the same day—and I will just quote part of it—an article by Harry Gannes:

Especially the Jewish peoples in the areas liberated by the Red Army will have cause for thanking. No longer will they be persecuted once the Red Army has set them free.

And here in New York several days later the Daily Worker article entitled "Freiheit Switchboard Mirrors Jewish Joy Here":

To the Jewish people in New York City with Landsleit (relatives) in Western Ukrainian and Western White Russia:

The Red Army is indeed an army of liberation, bringing freedom to those near and dear.

The switchboard of the Jewish Morning Freiheit has been flooded with calls these past few days from anxious relatives interested in learning the latest moves of the Red Army of freedom.

So, obviously the party press considered it important enough to hold in line those people—the Jews—and who would find it very difficult to accept the Nazi-Soviet pact, as I did, and I reached for this rationalization and I accepted it.

MR. TAVENNER. Did anything occur subsequently to that which cast doubt upon your mind that it was an army of liberation?

MR. ROSSEN. Well, aside from the immediate events of the past 6 months, I think—it must be—by this time I had a feeling—I had a feeling a long time ago, while I was in the party, that the Jewish question, or the party's relationship to the Jewish question, was, to put it mildly, not a very sincere one—that it was being used, I think, primarily for pretty optimistic reasons. The party was not very much interested in the question of Jews at any time. It became interested in the question of Zionism, the establishment of the Israeli State, during the war because it was to the best interests of the Soviet Union to win that war. It was also to our best interests—I mean, historically

speaking, of course, it was—and our allies at that point; but the use of that, and the switch, the espousal of Zionism, in the forties, was obviously a move which was dictated by necessity.

The switch on Zionism again was a move that was dictated by necessity. The Soviet Union switch on, for instance—I'm going to ramble a little, if I may, on this—I'm trying to piece it together—the whole approach, Communist approach, to the Jewish question was that only in a socialist society could the Jews find a place for themselves. They said, for instance, that the answer to the whole Jewish problem was *berebuchen*, which was an establishment they had set up somewhere along there. They pointed out, for instance, only in the Soviet Union a national tongue, which in terms of Yiddish—national culture—be perpetuated alongside of Russian-Soviet culture.

During the war, to hold the Jewish people, to bring them over to the side of the Soviet Union, they sent over—I think it was some time in 1942 or 1943—I don't quite remember the dates—a man called Michoels, who was the leading actor—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name, please?

Mr. ROSSEN. If I can, I will—M-i-c-h-o-e-l-s—and I think another man called Itzy Pfeffer, who was a Yiddish poet—

Mr. CLARDY. How do you spell that?

Mr. ROSSEN. P-f-e-f-f-e-r.

And all of the Jewish people in the party were genuinely excited by the fact the Soviet Union was taking this tremendous interest in the Yiddish problem, even to the point of cultural exchange.

We were proud of the fact—for instance, Michoels was the leading Shakespearean actor in the Soviet Union, and acted Shakespeare in Yiddish, and we talked to the men that came to Hollywood.

Now, it is very interesting that when the switch came, when it was no longer of Soviet interest to become interested or to project the Yiddish problem, they even switched on Michoels.

I remember reading some time ago that in the Czechoslovakian trials of the 9 men who were hung—and hung, in my opinion, for being Jews, and nothing else—I don't think they were traitors to the Soviet Union as such. I don't know. I wouldn't be able to judge that, but it is very interesting that the word "Jew" and the word "traitor" was equated openly by the Soviet Union—and I say the Soviet Union despite the fact that the trials took place in Czechoslovakia. It makes no difference.

And the Soviet Union was very well aware, knowing Communists as I have—no action is taken without the awareness of the consequence of that action. The Soviet Union knew that by raising the word "Jew" and raising the word "traitor" it was specifically inciting the people of these various countries, which had been hotbeds of anti-Semitism for hundreds of years, to anti-Semitism; and I think the act was done deliberately, and all of the good intentions, the avowed, professed interests of the Soviet Union in Jews as a minority was thrown overboard completely.

And the consequence of that act—I don't know, in terms of Jews, if it will ever be overcome because, you know, I don't know whether or not, despite the recent recantations of the Soviet Union—Malenkov saying "It wasn't me; it was two other fellows that did it"—I don't know whether you can take that out of the minds of these people

who live in these countries; and I think that, in my opinion, the—that is one of the most senile, immoral, and corrupt acts that has occurred in my lifetime—something I feel very deeply about, very strongly about—and I think if there was any illusion, any more, in terms of the feeling of the Soviet Union toward minorities—I think this act must expose to anybody that this is all an illusion and it has no basis in fact.

And even the fact of—the trick of saying it says specifically by law in the Soviet constitution, wherever it is, that anti-Semitism is forbidden is, to me—well, it's just nothing. It has no basis at all. It's immoral.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I do not believe you followed through, as you started to, in describing what you had learned in describing two individuals you had mentioned who were sent to this country—

Mr. ROSSEN. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). If I understood it correctly.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Well, I got kind of—well, intense about it, I suppose. I don't know whatever happened to Itzy Pfeffer, but in the conspiracy charge against Slonsky, Simon, et cetera, Michoels, who is now dead—was mentioned as one of the conspirators, one of the traitors, who conspired in 1944 for this horrible thing of helping the State of Israel—so that this man, who was sent from the Soviet Union to the United States, as a great artist—and he was—this man, when they didn't need him any more, and even though he was dead—and they were using his corpse, in a sense, to discredit the whole Jewish movement—this man was named as a conspirator. Now, he wasn't hanged. He died before that. I'm sure that the subsequent events have proven he probably would have been hanged at that time.

I came across some other things that I have here. I don't know—they probably will belabor the point at this time; but I think it's—as clearly as I can make it, I think that is my point in relation to that particular aspect.

Mr. SCHERER. Could I ask—

Mr. VELDE. I—

Mr. SCHERER. Go ahead. Did you—

Mr. VELDE. Yes. I want to ask a question at this point, since we are on the point of anti-Semitism in the Soviet government.

There are those, of course, among the Jewish faith who argue that the Soviet Government and the American Communist Party are not anti-Semitic.

I think there are those who conscientiously believe that the Soviet Government and the American Communist Party or any other party behind the Iron Curtain, or any other Communist Party in the Iron the American Communist Party are not anti-Semitic.

You probably know some of the arguments that these conscientious people—I am not talking about the ordinary member of the Communist Party who is disciplined by the Communist Party, but these conscientious people—who believe that the Soviet Government and the American Communist Party are not anti-Semitic.

What do they base their belief on?

Mr. ROSSEN. I honestly wouldn't know in terms of the American Communist Party, because this would be a recent development. I, personally, don't know.

I can understand a man on the American scene saying that the American Communist Party is not anti-Semitic—and I don't know whether it is. Frankly, I wouldn't know. I would doubt very much that it is; but to the extent that it supports Soviet policy in this—to the extent that it supports those trials—to the extent that it does not denounce the equation of the word "Jew" to traitor that has been made—to that extent, whether by conscious intent, or whatever it is—to that extent, it must be anti-Semitic.

Mr. VELDE. I think you are making a very excellent statement in that regard; and, of course, I think you realize, as we do, too, any form of totalitarianism is opposed to racial and religious minorities, and it would be rather absurd to think that totalitarian Russia is any different from any other totalitarian form of government in that regard.

The committee will be in recess for about 7 minutes, until 10 minutes until four.

(Whereupon, at 3:43 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 3:50 p. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 3:55 p. m., the following committee members being present: Representatives Kit Clardy (presiding), Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, and Clyde Doyle.)

Mr. CLARDY. The committee will be in order.

Are you ready?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROSSEN, you stated at the time you were first in Hollywood that there were various problems which had arisen in the Screen Writers' Guild.

Now, I am not going to ask you to discuss those matters because the committee has heard a great deal of evidence in regard to them, but I do want to ask you the general question of whether or not the Communist Party was making an effort to control or influence the policy of that group.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; it was, in the sense that known Communists always worked to influence whatever trade union they belonged to.

This—again, I want to make this point clear: A great many issues of the Communist Party—a great many issues the Communist Party fought for were basically very good issues. The fact that—the fact that it enhanced the power of the Communist Party is another matter.

But we met in Hollywood. We had Communist Party members on the executive board. We discussed the policies outside of the executive board, and in general tried to influence them.

I think at that time we got a lot of good things done—the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you said a very interesting thing. You indicated that it was only by the sponsoring of good causes that the Communist Party could increase its power.

Mr. ROSSEN. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, to what extent was the increasing of power an essential in the Communist Party? Just what do you mean by that?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, we can't think of power in its naked sense in Hollywood, you know—power in terms of its effect upon Hollywood.

What would power really mean?

Power would mean getting new recruits. Power would mean attracting people because of the prestige of other people. Power would mean by getting important people to come into the Communist Party, or even nonimportant people. It would mean increasing the financial structure, and in this sense the Communist Party could function effectively in Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. You made mention of the fact that there were various persons on the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild who were members of the Communist Party.

I have before me a partial list of members of the executive board. Would you mind glancing at this list and give us the names of those who were members of the executive board who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party, probably from the years 1937 to 1939?

Mr. ROSSEN. On the first list here I see Ring Lardner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ring Lardner?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ring Lardner, Jr.?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Maurice Rapf.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the last name?

Mr. ROSSEN. R-a-p-f.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, if you will, pronounce those names as distinctly as you can, please.

Mr. ROSSEN. Budd Wilson Schulberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. And will you spell the last name each time?

Mr. ROSSEN. S-c-h-u-l-b-e-r-g.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you mark a check mark on the names of those that you have identified?

Mr. CLARDY. Keep your voice as high as you can. I see the press is busily copying these down. They want to be accurate, I am sure.

Mr. ROSSEN. Budd Wilson Schulberg, and the assistant secretary of the guild, Ann Roth.

Mr. CLARDY. Ann who?

Mr. ROSSEN. Roth—R-o-t-h.

Now, that list, as I see here, is from 1939 to 1940.

This list is 1940 to 1941. I can identify on this list Sidney Buchman.

Mr. CLARDY. Sidney Buchman?

Mr. ROSSEN. Buchman—B-u-c-h-m-a-n.

Lester Cole.

Mr. CLARDY. C-o-l-e?

Mr. ROSSEN. C-o-l-e.

I am sorry. I will spell them out.

Mr. CLARDY. If you will.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Gertrude Purcell—P-u-r-c-e-l-l.

Mr. CLARDY. The first name is Gertrude?

Mr. ROSSEN. Gertrude.

Dalton Trumbo.

Mr. CLARDY. Please spell that last name.

Mr. ROSSEN. T-r-u-m-b-o.

And I have a list here 1942 to 1943. John Howard Lawson—L-a-w-s-o-n.

I want you to bear in mind that I will only identify people as being members of the Communist Party in terms of my direct knowledge of it.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, that is all we want.

Mr. ROSSEN. Not in terms of supposition or gossip.

So, I am going to skip a name here.

Mr. DOYLE. We don't want it on any other basis.

Mr. ROSSEN. Marguerite Roberts—R-o-b-e-r-t-s.

That pretty much concludes the list I have in front of me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any particular project of the Screen Writers' Guild with which you became identified?

Mr. ROSSEN. Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I was involved in a great—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you a direct question about it.

Mr. ROSSEN. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Screen Writers' Guild sponsor the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, briefly, about that, please?

Mr. ROSSEN. Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was formed, I think, on—Pearl Harbor was December 7, and we had an executive board meeting on December 8, 1941, at which point we were all concerned with what writers could do in Hollywood in terms of the war effort, and had a full discussion at the board meeting. We decided to contact the Writers' War Board which had been set up here in New York.

About 3 months—no—3 weeks later, I think, we decided that we would set up what was known originally as a writers' mobilization—in the literal translation of the word, a mobilization of writers. Out of that organization, and a genuine desire to participate in the war effort, all the other guilds—the creative guilds—in Hollywood expressed a desire to join that guild—to join the mobilization, and I think subsequently it had in it. I'd say, about five various guilds and some of the craft unions came into it. I can't remember them offhand, unless I see the agenda.

The main financial burden of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was carried by the Screen Writers' Guild. I think the membership as a whole—and this was not a Communist project as such—voted to put aside a sum of \$10,000 a year for the work of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization and, in general, the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was concerned with getting writers to service the various Government agencies, sending them to write films for Army training—Army training films—sending entertainment around to the war plants—

I think there was an outfit called the Lunch Time Follies, and I am not sure whether it originated on the east or west coast.

We were also concerned with raising the cultural understanding of the various countries with each other. We tried to effect an exchange of craft discussion between England, writers in England, and writers in the Soviet Union, and I think some correspondence and some material went back and forth; but they were basically—my recollection—

all things that concerned themselves with the discussion of craft and techniques, and how to utilize them, in terms of the war effort.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, Mr. Richard Collins has testified before the committee and has described how it was the purpose of the Communist Party to prostitute this organization at the close of the war. Were you familiar in any way with its operations in 1945 or 1946?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; not very much. I was chairman of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization from 1941 to, I think, sometime in 1944.

I went to New York and stayed in New York from 1944 to 1945. When I came back, I was more or less a nominal member of the board and was not very vitally active, so that what went on in the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization after the close of the war I would have very little direct knowledge of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there anything of an unusual nature about the manner in which you were selected as chairman of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; no. I think that was rather spontaneous——

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there——

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). As I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Anything of an unusual character about the manner in which you left as its chairman?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, in order to go into that, I would have to—I'm kind of nonplussed here. I don't want to mention—well, I'll just preface the names involved with whether or not they were members of the Communist Party, because I don't want to raise any questions of individuals here in any sense and have them in any sense bear the——

Mr. TAVENNER. Not at all. There should be no connotation at all placed upon reference to any name that you may have to refer to, if you do—and, in fact, I prefer you not refer——

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, suppose——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). To any names.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, suppose I just tell the story generally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just tell the story generally. I think that would suffice.

Mr. ROSSEN. I—during the war, the Communist Party, under Browder's leadership policy of popular front, an attempt to draw all people into the war effort—and the Communist Party particularly decided that this was a particularly good time to attract more people to—well, again to strengthen the party—and it was——

Mr. TAVENNER. In order that the party itself may have more power.

Mr. ROSSEN. Always.

Mr. TAVENNER. Always.

Mr. ROSSEN. That's every——

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. I mean, that was a natural flow of things.

It was decided at that time it was important that a man who was not a member of the Communist Party be chairman of the organization as part of the—part of the move to broaden the popular front, and——

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, part of the move of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. This was decided not within the mobilization.

I want to make very clear here the decisions of the mobilization, in my opinion, in my recollection, in my time, were, I think, a very dedicated—very dedicated decisions in terms of the war.

So, the decisions I am referring to are decisions made outside of the mobilization within the Communist Party and affecting the mobilization, and the decision at that time was made that I step down and that this man be placed as chairman, which I agreed to.

The various guilds didn't want this at the time, but I handed in my resignation and then some of the guild members felt I ought to be given some kind of a testimonial or award for the work I had done in the 3 years, and again the decision was made that this would reflect upon the non-Communist, would give him too heavy a burden to carry, and in order to attract him and his work, and to influence him, more directly, that I step out as quietly and out of the back door, and leave the organization, as I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was done at the direction and instance of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the leader in that movement within the Communist Party who dictated that policy?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I—I suppose—

Mr. TAVENNER. Or can it be put that bluntly?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; it can.

I was just thinking of the word "dictator." I suppose you can use the word "persuader." John Howard Lawson.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a list of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization steering committee during the year 1944-45.

Mr. ROSSEN. 1944-45.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was published 1944-45, but I'm not certain it was actually for that year.

Let me hand it to you and ask you, as I did before, whether or not you can identify any members of the steering committee as members of the Communist Party; and, if so, give their names, please, and check them on the list, and spell the names.

Mr. ROSSEN. Pauline Lauber Finn—F-i-n-n. She was executive secretary.

Mr. CLARDY. Pauline—

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. And the middle name?

Mr. ROSSEN. Lauber—L-a-u-b-e-r—Finn—F-i-n-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not she was a functionary in the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Not to my knowledge, she wasn't.

Bill Blowitz.

I'm bearing in mind that some of these names have been mentioned before by me, and I am not mentioning them again.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't get that name.

Mr. ROSSEN. Some of these names that I am going over have been mentioned before in terms of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Do you want me to repeat them?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I think you should—

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). In light of the activities which you have just described.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you repeat that last name, and spell it?

Mr. ROSSEN. The last one was Bill Blowitz—B-l-o-w-i-t-z.

Sidney Buchman—B-u-c-h-m-a-n.

Richard Collins—C-o-l-l-i-n-s.

John Howard Lawson—L-a-w-s-o-n.

Melvin Levy—L-e-v-y.

Joseph Mischel—M-i-s-c-h-e-l.

Sam Moore—M-o-o-r-e.

Meta Reis—R-e-i-s.

Vic Shapiro—S-h-a-p-i-r-o.

Louis Solomon—S-o-l-o-m-o-n.

Mr. CLARDY. Suppose you tell us again what that list represents.

Mr. ROSSEN. This is a list of the steering committee of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, 1944—the date here is 1944-45. I wouldn't be sure of the date. I don't know whether that is the exact date or not.

Mr. CLARDY. And the names you have read are the Communist members?

Mr. ROSSEN. Members of the Communist Party, who were on the steering committee of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization at that time, or thereabouts. I can't vouch for the dates.

Mr. DOYLE. And about what percentage of the members of that steering committee, according to your record and word now, were members of the Communist Party, assuming that list is the total list of the steering committee, numerically?

Mr. ROSSEN. I'd say about a third—it seems—rough guess.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. CLARDY. Enough anyway to pretty well control actions if they stuck together against a divided majority?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, except that in cases of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization I can't think of any direct political action that was taken through the mobilization. In other words, the decisions that were made for its immediate purpose certainly had no relation to politics.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, aside from the question of politics, there was a project of that organization known as the Writers' Congress, which was held in October 1943, was it not?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was during the time you were chairman of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask there, Mr. Tavenner: It was Communist Party politics and caucus, wasn't it, in a sense, when they pulled you out as the distinguished chairman of the mobilization group?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. That was political?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, if you want to make that interpretation.

Mr. DOYLE. And that vitally affected the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; I think the men who followed were very good.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, grant that, but it was done by a Communist Party caucus—

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. Which shaped the destiny of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization from that point on?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, weren't regular caucuses held by the Communist Party, as members, upon which courses of action would be determined upon and put forward and pushed through at the meetings, regardless of whether it was or could now be stamped as party politics or not? At least they did attempt to put forward a program and push it, didn't they?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I think you could safely say "yes" to that.

The reason it seems a little—you must understand, the mobilization was not a formal organization.

Mr. CLARDY. I understand.

Mr. ROSSEN. You see, there was no membership in the writers' organization as such, as you belong to the Screen Writers' Guild. You merely indicated that you were available—rank and file—to work for the mobilization so that the question of a vote, for instance, could come up only in the steering committee.

Mr. MOULDER. When you were selected as chairman, were you known as a Communist, as a member of the Communist Party, by the non-Communist members of the steering committee?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I wasn't known in terms of my own admission, but I would say that a great many people surmised it.

Mr. CLARDY. You weren't advertising it, though?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; no. None of us were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, with regard to this project about which we spoke, the Writers' Congress which was held in October 1943, did Communist Party members of the mobilization caucus pass upon any of the phases of that project?

Mr. ROSSEN. Oh, yes; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee briefly about that.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, the Writers' Congress was a project that was begun sometime—I think it was 1942. Its purpose was to get together as many of the writing talents and creative and critical people around from all walks of—from all parts of the country, and even from other countries, to discuss techniques, contents of film, literature, et cetera—all aimed at the role that the writer should play in the war.

Quite naturally the Communist Party was the most active in organizing this Writers' Congress, which I, personally, felt was very successful and had some very good things in it. The Communist Party members were the most active. They worked hardest. They were dedicated toward making this a success, and we met quite regularly in terms of fraction meetings and discussed the whole program of the Writers' Congress, at first in a general sense and later on in a kind of detailed sense, in terms of what was to go into the various panels, in terms of the editing of the presentation of the thing.

It was worked out very carefully and quite brilliantly, and the record will show we did have people from all over the world who came there, spoke, and that was done in cooperation with the University of California at Los Angeles, and—but I would say it was primarily organized and executed by members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did the members of the Communist Party in caucus select those who were to be chairmen of the various panels?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I think the answer to that is yes and no. Yes, in the sense that the Communist Party members would put themselves forth or forward to become chairmen. First of all, they were willing to do that kind of work and, secondly, I was chairman of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. I was a member of the Communist Party. I knew whether or not some of these men were or were not members of the Communist Party. I knew whether or not they were good workers and responsible people; and so, when this was brought to me, in terms of the chairman, of saying, "Pick this committee," in whatever decisions I—I had—well, naturally, I would pick the chairman who was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a list of the committees of the Writers' Congress, and I will ask you to name the chairmen of the various committees or panels who were members, and known to you to be members, of the Communist Party.

Mr. ROSSEN. Now, you want me to repeat again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I would like for you to repeat again a name, even if mentioned prior to this.

Mr. ROSSEN. You are now talking in terms of chairmen?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; speak now of the chairmen, those who were chairmen, of the various panels, giving the name of the panel and the name of the chairman, if he is a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge.

Mr. ROSSEN. All right.

We come to the first panel—a panel on minority groups—Ring Lardner, Jr., a member of the Communist Party.

The second one was problems of the peace. The chairman was Melvin Levy. He was a member of the party.

Nature of the enemy—John Wexley, member of the party.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you spell that?

Mr. ROSSEN. W-e-x-l-e-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you again check those you name, please?

Mr. ROSSEN. I am doing that.

Propaganda analysis—not to my knowledge.

American scene. I was chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Say that again.

Mr. ROSSEN. American scene—s-c-e-n-e. I was the chairman of that.

Mr. CLARDY. What did you say about the one preceding that?

Mr. ROSSEN. I have no knowledge about whether or not the chairman—

Mr. CLARDY. I see.

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). Was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. I thought that is what you meant, but it was a little vague.

Mr. ROSSEN. Pan-American affairs—Louis Solomon, a member of the party.

Feature film—Richard Collins was a member of the party.

Training films—Bernard Vorhaus.

Mr. CLARDY. You better spell it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell it, please.

Mr. ROSSEN. V-o-r-h-a-u-s.

Mr. CLARDY. What is that first letter? V?

Mr. ROSSEN. V.

Mr. CLARDY. V as in victory?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Joseph Mischel—M-i-s-c-h-e-l.

Mr. CLARDY. That is which one?

Mr. ROSSEN. Writers in exile.

Humor and the war—Stanley Roberts.

Those are the chairmen of the various panels.

Mr. CLARDY. How many did they miss out on?

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will let me ask a question first—

Mr. CLARDY. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe that will be more applicable.

Who was the chairman of the panel on documentary films?

Mr. ROSSEN. Joris Ivens.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party, of your own knowledge?

Mr. ROSSEN. Not of my own knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, he has been identified by testimony of other—

Mr. CLARDY. Is that I-v-e-n-s?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; the first name is J-o-r-i-s.

Who was chairman of the panel entitled "Songwriting in War"?

Mr. ROSSEN. Earl Robinson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Not of my own direct knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. He has been identified by testimony before the committee, Mr. Chairman.

Who was chairman of the panel on arrangements?

Mr. ROSSEN. Committee on arrangements.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think he was also treasurer of the conference.

Mr. ROSSEN. Francis Faragoh.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. I can't make an identification of Francis Faragoh as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time—

Mr. CLARDY. What was that name again?

Mr. ROSSEN. Francis Faragoh.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name, please?

Mr. ROSSEN. F-a-r-a-g-o-h.

Mr. TAVENNER. Francis is F-r-a-n-c-i-s, isn't it?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; it is F-r-a-n-c-i-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify him as having attended fractions of the Communist Party—

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; he's—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or meetings?

Mr. ROSSEN. He attended fractions of the Communist Party meeting, but in all of the discussions I ever heard—it's always the impression of myself and other people that he was not a member of the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, we wondered why he wasn't, but he was not, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. But he attended the meetings?

Mr. ROSSEN. Various fraction meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he take part in a business or discussion of the meetings?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; on specific issues, yes.

Mr. CLARDY. His name was brought into the——

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Faragoh has been identified by several witnesses as a member.

Mr. CLARDY. Most recently.

Mr. TAVENNER. He took advantage of the fifth amendment when called upon to testify.

Mr. CLARDY. Most recently at the Los Angeles hearing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. And, now, let me check on that. Let's see how many of those were not controlled by Communists, either identified by you or the committee.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I don't know the names you have read off.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, how many were controlled by Communists by your count there?

Mr. ROSSEN. Nine here.

Mr. TAVENNER. And——

Mr. CLARDY. And we have named three.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). I have named Ivens, Robinson, and Faragoh.

That would make 12.

Mr. DOYLE. Twelve out of how many committees?

Mr. ROSSEN. Twelve out of twenty-one.

Mr. CLARDY. Twelve out of twenty-one.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. And some of the others you know nothing about?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; not to my own knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. There appears on this record the names of those who were members of the advisory committee and a general committee, as well as those who took part in the panels. Will you examine those hurriedly, please, and see if you can identify the names of other persons known to you to have been members of the Communist Party.

Mr. ROSSEN. Names that I have not——

Mr. TAVENNER. That you have not mentioned. That is, that you have not mentioned in connection with the Writers' Congress.

Mr. ROSSEN. You want me to also——

You are talking now purely about the advisory committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; all of the other committees——

Mr. ROSSEN. Including the panels?

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Including the panels, themselves.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, there is Edward Dmytryk—D-m-y-t-r-y-k.

Mr. CLARDY. What was the first name?

Mr. ROSSEN. Edward.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dmytryk was one of the early witnesses who testified before this committee in connection with our hearings in Hollywood and was one of the 10 who was convicted of contempt as a result of his refusal to testify in 1947.

Do you recall what he said in his testimony about the effect or the part that this conference played in his joining the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; not specifically—rather vaguely. I know he made some reference to it, but I just—

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you—

Mr. ROSSEN. He made some reference in terms of the fact that was one of the things—his admiration for the way it was organized, for what was being said—one of the things that brought him into the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes—

Mr. ROSSEN. I don't remember—

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, in substance, what his testimony was.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Then, we go to Frank Tuttle—T-u-t-t-l-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a director, was he not?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And he came voluntarily from Europe to testify before the committee when his name appeared in connection with these matters.

Mr. CLARDY. That was in 1951?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROSSEN. Then—

Mr. DOYLE. You mean he came clear from Europe to help the committee in its investigation?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; he was one of the early men to testify.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, didn't he plead the amendments of the Constitution then, anyway?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; he made a very strong argument as to why he was not pleading the fifth amendment.

Mr. ROSSEN. Dan James—J-a-m-e-s.

Ben Barzman—B-a-r-z-m-a-n.

Paul Trivers—T-r-i-v-e-r-s.

Guy Endore—E-n-d-o-r-e.

Waldo Salt—S-a-l-t.

Leo Townsend—T-o-w-n-s-e-n-d.

I am not repeating any of the names I previously mentioned.

Ian Hunter—H-u-n-t-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name Salt?

Mr. ROSSEN. S-a-l-t.

Mr. CLARDY. I wondered if that was correct or it was the name we heard yesterday with a "z" in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't think so.

Mr. CLARDY. Not the same one.

Mr. ROSSEN. Henry Blankfort, Jr.—B-l-a-n-k-f-o-r-t.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean—Henry—

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, there was another Blankfort. I just want to be sure. I see this is Henry Blankfort.

Mr. TAVENNER. Oh, yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. Georgia Backus—B-a-c-k-u-s.

Lou Harris—H-a-r-r-i-s.

Mr. CLARDY. By the way, are these all the names by which they were publicly known?

(Mr. Rossen responded by nodding his head.)

Mr. CLARDY. Your answer is "Yes"?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Fred Rinaldo—R-i-n-a-l-d-o.

Hy Kraft—K-r-a-f-t.

Mr. CLARDY. Hy?

Mr. ROSSEN. Hy—H-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not that is an abbreviation of his first name?

Mr. ROSSEN. I don't know. I've always known him as Hy.

Adrian Scott—S-c-o-t-t.

Harold Buchman—B-u-c-h-m-a-n.

I think that about does it, as far as my own direct knowledge is concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you this: Did you become acquainted with Earl Browder?

Mr. ROSSEN. I met Earl Browder several times, but I met him—I don't think more than several times—by "several" I mean 2 or 3—but I met him in Hollywood in—somewhere in the early part of the forties. It might be 1942 or 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have previously referred to a person by the name of Max Silver as a high functionary in the Communist Party in Los Angeles County. Were you acquainted with him?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of the testimony of Mr. Max Silver on January 22, 1952, Mr. Silver testified as follows, regarding the advice that Mr. Browder had given regarding the operation of the Communist Party in Hollywood:

Browder used to tell Hollywood, "We are less interested in a film that has Communist content, where a few hundred people will come and see it. We are more interested in an ordinary John and Mary picture, in which there is only a drop of progressive thought in it."

So, therefore the approach must not be that the party wanted to take Hollywood by the throat and change the content. The party understood that Hollywood is a cultural center and has very prominent people there, people who write, who go to Washington, who go to New York—if you influence their thinking, their product will be somewhat different. We are going to have a different product.

And then Mr. Silver continued and said:

Of course, along with that comes the party organization, with all its maneuvers of placing itself in a position where it can make decisions for the organization.

Now, do you recall having been present at any time when Earl Browder discussed the objectives of the Communist Party, from the Communist Party standpoint, in Hollywood?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I—I recall that at one meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who attended that meeting?

Mr. ROSSEN. To the best of my recollection, there was Browder; I think Silver was there—I'm not quite sure; I know another functionary in Los Angeles was there, besides Browder—John Howard Lawson, myself, and Sidney Buchman.

We met somewhere in Los Angeles—I don't remember the place—and we discussed—rather, Browder discussed—we didn't; we just listened.

In substance, what Browder—what Silver claims Browder said, with some minor corrections—I don't quite think that is accurate, all the way down. I can remember Browder saying that the important thing that—it was a very bad thing to heavily weigh pictures with

propaganda, which is an instance—what Silver reports him as saying. Well, as a matter of fact, this would be impossible in Hollywood, anyway—that it was more important to use the formula kind of motion pictures which the average audience would understand. He particularly referred to cowboy formula at that time.

I, personally, thought it was all very funny, and even—even at that time—because I thought at that time it indicated something that Browder probably never thought he had, but I thought he had, by that statement, because I thought he was talking about the audience being pretty literate. There wasn't very much respect for the audience—the fact that you were asked to do things in the most elemental and primitive terms. However, he did speak about the fact it was necessary for writers—tying up this particular thesis—it was necessary for writers to write successful films so that their prestige could be increased and, therefore, their value to the party be increased.

In terms of the content, which was the last part of that statement—the indication, therefore, they would increase it in content—that is, the content being increased—I think that was more a hope on Browder's part of a long-range project than it was a reality, because I don't think he expected it, and I don't actually remember him saying that part of it.

Mr. CLARDY. Did he, however, convey the impression that he thought there should be at least a drop or two of Communist poison in each of the products?

Mr. ROSSEN. I don't remember him saying that.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, how did he phrase it?

Mr. ROSSEN. I think, as my recollection—I think he talked primarily of the prestige of the writer—the fact it was very important for a Communist to be the best in his field, to increase his prestige to such a degree that he would be respected as a craftsman in his own industry; and we very seriously discussed that.

Mr. CLARDY. Wasn't that so he might be placed in a better position to further the Communist ends?

Mr. ROSSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, you said a moment ago he said it shouldn't be loaded down with Communist propaganda. You at least agreed with that part of the statement, as I understood it.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Well, there's always the question—there's always the question of what was known in terms—in party terms—as sectarianism—in other words, where you presented the argument so one-sidedly in its most black and white terms that nobody would quite accept, but in terms of actual propaganda in film I cannot remember him saying that; and, too, I don't think it would have been possible.

Mr. CLARDY. No; no. You misunderstood me.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well—

Mr. CLARDY. Was it not his intention to get across to you the idea that you should not make it so blatant but that you should be more subtle and careful and not defeat your own end?

Mr. ROSSEN. I'm really trying to answer that.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. I am just trying—

Mr. CLARDY. I want your recollection as to what he was trying to get across.

Mr. ROSSEN. I just cannot recall any of the facts of the discussion in terms of the—in terms of the content of the film.

Mr. CLARDY. I see.

Mr. ROSSEN. I can recall very specifically the necessity—the obligation and the necessity—of a Communist Party member to become the best in his field, if he could; to study, to engage in craft discussions; for one Communist to help another, in terms of craft discussions, in terms of making them into better screen writers, so that, naturally, the prestige of the party—of these particular members—would have to be enhanced, and more people, as they began to know these were members of the party, would come into the party.

Mr. SCHERER. Not—

Mr. CLARDY. I see. A recruiting method, as much as anything else.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; and also—also in terms of the method of using your name—the prestige you carried in terms of whatever specific movement was being carried on.

Mr. CLARDY. You would be the sugar that would attract the flies, in other words?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, the eventual objection of the Communist Party perhaps was, as you started to indicate, a long-range objective, and these were necessary preliminary steps, were they not?

Mr. ROSSEN. Oh, yes. I mean it's—

Mr. SCHERER. You mean—

Mr. ROSSEN. You couldn't—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). You couldn't hope to influence the film at that early date, could you?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; I don't think so.

Mr. CLARDY. They wanted to build you up.

Mr. SCHERER. The eventual objective was perhaps to influence the films?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; it would have to be.

Mr. SCHERER. A long-range objective?

Mr. ROSSEN. Certainly. It is a partisan point of view. It is a point of view of impressing upon people your own point of view, and you use whatever means you can and are available to you at a given moment, and that you can do.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, if more people in this movie industry as a whole became members of the party, then at that time it would be much easier or at a later date it would be much easier to foster the objectives in the party?

Mr. ROSSEN. I think that was the hope.

Mr. SCHERER. That was the hope?

Mr. ROSSEN. I don't think it would have happened that way.

Mr. SCHERER. You don't think it would?

Mr. ROSSEN. Not with the structure of the industry as I knew it. I think you would have to go much further, you know, but in a sense, when you talk about propaganda, you have to understand—you don't have to be told in terms of putting things into a picture.

Nobody can come to you—maybe they did—I don't recall anybody coming and saying, "Put this in a picture," or "Express this idea," et cetera.

However, if you are a Marxist, you think like a Marxist.

Now, this doesn't necessarily mean that the pictures you do are not good pictures——

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). Or good causes, but you will take the approach which the Communist Party and yourself hope is a good Marxist position.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, that is the long-range objective?

Mr. ROSSEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. If you have enough screen writers who are thoroughly indoctrinated and thoroughly sold on the Marxist or Communist theory, or Communist Party line, that eventually would be an inevitable result, wouldn't it?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; within the limits they had to work in.

Mr. CLARDY. The general idea being the greater your reputation, the greater your influence would be, and the greater results would flow from whatever you might do to aid the party cause?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's quite correct.

Mr. CLARDY. Isn't that the reason why they bring teachers and ministers, as well as people in the movie industry——

Mr. ROSSEN. Now, I——

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Into their circles?

Mr. ROSSEN. I really wouldn't know. You know I have no knowledge on that subject.

Mr. CLARDY. That at least is one of the reasons they bring people who travel in your circle in it?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; from my own direct knowledge I know that.

Mr. SCHERER. This is a little far afield from what we have been discussing, but you touched on it at the beginning of your testimony: I was interested to know whether you have made a study of the recent friendly overtures upon the part of the Russian or Soviet Government toward the Arab States and their rather unfriendly acts toward Israel.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I thought I had—I supposed I rambled a little, but I think that is part of the general picture I was trying to project.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, then——

Mr. ROSSEN. In other words, the support of Israel during the period—during the period in which it was to the interests of the Soviet Government, it was in favor of Israel; but when it no longer became—when Israel went over into the western democracies, then the Soviet Union's policy was to support the Arabs.

Mr. SCHERER. Has anything in your reading or study indicated that the Russians are supporting the Arabs in opposition to Israel today because of Arabian oil?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; I honestly haven't come across anything specific that I can talk about on the subject. It's a general—in terms of their vote in the U. N., et cetera, in terms of supporting certain measures—but in terms of my own specific knowledge, I wouldn't have that.

Mr. SCHERER. That would be again the Russians taking a stand not on principle——

Mr. ROSSEN. On expedience.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). But on their own self-interests?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you one more question about the matter of the Browder conference.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated, in your judgment, it was the hope of Browder that by indoctrination, the proper type of indoctrination, of screen writers that they might influence the product. If that was his hope, would you not say, then, that was one of the objects as far as Browder and the Communist Party were concerned in spending so much time and effort in organizing the Communist Party within the industry?

Mr. ROSSEN. Oh, I think it was one of the ultimate objectives. I just think, you know—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). The industry is so set up that it made it that much more difficult; that is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you spoke of another objective of a more practical nature—of at least a more immediate nature—that of the prestige that the Communist Party would gain and the power that it would necessarily gain by its members being efficient and having attained names of prominence.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, at this point we will call a 5-minute recess.

(Whereupon, at 4:45 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 4:50 p. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 4:55 p. m., the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Morgan M. Moulder, and Clyde Doyle.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen, you were just at the point of describing the practical importance of members of the Communist Party within the screen-writing group to gain such prestige as you could for the benefit of the party.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Now, was there any device used or resorted to by the Communist Party which would increase the prestige of writers generally in line with the matter you have been talking about?

Mr. ROSSEN. It was done on two levels. The first level was the schools which were open to nonparty people; but within the party itself we had in Hollywood what was known as the writers' clinic.

Mr. TAVENNER. The writers' clinic.

Mr. ROSSEN. There was—

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, was that a group of Communist Party writers?

Mr. ROSSEN. Only Communist Party writers—

Mr. TAVENNER. Only Communist Party writers.

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). In our Communist Party group, which was called together—I don't remember the dates of it. It was called together for the purpose of helping other Communists become better screenwriters; for the purpose of the older and more experienced screenwriters, who would naturally take the leadership in this—scripts were brought there, analyzed, and mostly in relation to craft prob-

lems, and it was felt by discussion between—of this various group of people in the party that the Communist Party members would become helped to become better screenwriters, and thus in their own work would get more prestige and would follow out on the theory that the Communist Party had the most attractive, the most able, the most intelligent, the most resourceful people, and would therefore draw to the Communist Party more people than they ordinarily would; and tied up with the fact of prestige is also a financial question which—as people get more prestige and become better known they also earn more money, and as they earn more money, pay more dues. But I think that, in substance, was the nature of the writers' clinic.

Mr. TAVENNER. It assured inexperienced writers within the Communist Party of being able to compete with non-Communist writers?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, sir; yes, indeed. That's right. It equipped them in terms of the competition of the industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. It also would have afforded the opportunity of the leaders, who may have been more thoroughly indoctrinated in Marxism, to exercise their influence upon the younger members?

Mr. ROSSEN. Oh, unquestionably, unquestionably. No Communist Party meeting could ever be held on an isolated—in an isolated sense. The point is: When you went to a Communist Party meeting and you discussed technique, inevitably—inevitably—the political question, in terms of your Marxist understanding, would have to come into play. So discussion—remember, there is such a thing as Marxist criticism——

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). And the discussion is always based on a Marxist point of view. It doesn't follow that particular script is going to be made into a picture, but it does follow the younger writers would naturally be very impressed and would follow the lead of the older and more successful and more experienced writers; and we gave a lot of time to it—a great deal of time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Now, let me ask you this: You have advised the committee that you spent in money or that you paid into the Communist Party for Communist Party purposes as much as \$40,000 during the 10 years that you were a member of the Communist Party. From this description you have given us you must have done a great deal of work. Will you give the committee some idea what your Communist Party membership required of you?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, it doesn't only add up to work; it adds up to—I mean money—it adds up to work, and the amount of time you give. For instance, when I was chairman of the mobilization,¹ I might attend four meetings on just mobilization work a week, in addition to my party meetings. I would also attend fraction meetings; luncheons.

I was very deeply involved, and I would say a good deal of my time was spent between the studio and my life in the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Weren't you paid any salary by the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. SCHERER. Salary?

Mr. ROSSEN. Not unless I paid it myself; no. I'm afraid I wasn't. Of course, I—you know, I believed in what I was doing, and believed

¹ Hollywood Writers' Mobilization.

very hard, and I felt this belief should be carried out, both in terms of the amount of money I spent and the amount of time I gave.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). I imagine that's the way I felt about it at that time, and felt very hard.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, as a result of your experience, did you change your views with regard to the Communist Party being the medium through which you could accomplish or should attempt to accomplish the ideals which you have described?

Mr. ROSSEN. I actually changed my views a great many years ago. Getting out of the party, as I tried to state earlier, is no process of suddenly making a decision and saying, "On January 5, so-and-so and so-and-so; I am going to get out of the party." You don't. The first—first of all, there is a reluctance to give up what you have put so much effort and belief in; but, as you begin to see certain things develop in front of your eyes, in terms of your experience, you begin, in a sense, to move away from it; you begin to withdraw from certain activities; you begin, in a sense, to stop paying dues.

Now, for instance in the terms of the prestige of writers—well, there's nothing wrong, is there, aside—if you isolate it for a minute—from the point of view of the Communist Party—nothing wrong in one man helping another man to become a better screenwriter?

As a matter of fact, I would like to see that kind of thing done on a broad scale. I think it would be very excellent. I think the Screen Writers' Guild might do it.

However, let's take the history of a great many people in terms of prestige. Now, a man becomes a better screenwriter. His prestige enhances the party. He becomes important to the party.

Now, at that point the party is no longer really and truly interested in this man as a writer or as a creative artist. They're interested in his functions or in his functioning as a member of the Communist Party. They're interested in how many meetings he goes to; to how many organizations does he belong.

And then when he cries out and says, "I want to be a writer; I want to continue with my work"—at this point they have very—he finds very short, swift—and I have seen many writers in my time destroyed by the very thing—sort of—I don't know—sort of like eating yourself, because they no longer had time for writing.

The Communist Party made great demands on their time, and when a man said, "Basically I am—you know, I came in because I am a writer; I want to be a better writer; I want to be a better Marxist writer," or call it whatever you will—where at this point the Communist Party position says, "Oh, no; now you are a Communist; you will accept Communist Party discipline; you will go to meetings; you will go to functions."

In other words, you now are made into what I consider, a cliché word, by this time, a party hack, and now the party is no longer interested in your creative development.

The Maltz¹ controversy, which has been talked about at great length at hearings of this committee since 1951, basically stems out of that inability on the part of Maltz to find time for himself, to find the interest in him as a creative writer.

¹ Albert Maltz.

The excessive demands made upon Maltz and upon his time—I sat in a meeting, 1943, somewhere in or about, which is way before the Maltz controversy, at which this thing was hammered out and at which Maltz was told his first function was to be a Communist; and I believe, without—this is surmise on my part, but I believe that Maltz letter of protest at the kind of writing that was being done by Communists—you remember the whole Maltz controversy actually grew out of this basic feeling that he was being used and that the party no longer really cared in terms of his creative ability for growth, and I think this was a common thing, in my experience in the party, and naturally you began to see all of these things in different lights; you began to get the feeling that, in a sense, where you always felt you were using people, you know, trying to convert them, and so forth. You began to suddenly see you were being used; that the party respect for you, the party veneration of the masses, which is a wonderful word—its so-called feeling for the masses, for people—somehow or other never really expressed itself in terms of its feeling for the individual. There was quite a separation between the word “masses” and the word “person” and that—it didn’t equate itself at all.

I always felt, for instance, that—I felt for a long time—not always would not be true—I felt, for instance, the Communist Party of the United States did not really belong to the American scene.

Now, I didn’t base that on anything I knew. I didn’t base that on whether I knew they were operating in terms of the Cominform, and what have you. I based it on the kind of writing you read in the party press during those days. The words that were used; the expressions—all of it was foreign to the American—to the understanding of the American people. It was almost like Russian being translated actually. I also felt that—as I went on in the party, I felt that the American people obviously, even expressing it in a purely political sense, didn’t want the Communist Party.

The Communist Party was on the ballot in many States. People ran for office in the Communist Party. People had a chance to vote—democratic process. They didn’t vote very many in.

Obviously the average man, the man who walks in to ballot, didn’t want—didn’t really want—it and you began to feel there was this tremendous separation between—this was not a movement that originated out of the American people and that the American people wanted.

Then, of course, when you get to the great Duclos situation—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let me interrupt you there a moment. I am very much interested in your statement that a person would be built up so that the Communist Party could have the benefit of his prestige, but after the period had been reached when the prestige had been accomplished or acquired he was then, instead of being helped individually, to be converted, as I understand your testimony, as an instrument purely for the benefit of the party.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I accept—

Mr. TAVENNER. I don’t know whether I have stated that correctly.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, except for the—in terms of the work; actually, in terms of the action—in other words, the demands made upon the man was such that he was given a sense of guilt if he couldn’t fulfill

them—he was being a bad party member—the fact of his own creative growth, his own personal relationships, were completely ignored.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question right there: Do I understand your ultimate conclusion, then, at that point is that the individual—his spirit, mind, and body, his personality, his character, everything about him, mentally, morally, and spiritually, is absorbed for the purposes of the Communist Party rather than for his further individual progress or achievement in whatever his line may be?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, it's absorbed or he goes into a process of rebellion, which may take a period of years to ultimately express, and maybe he doesn't express it even today, because that's a very long period—call it a period of disassociating yourself from that kind of thing; but unquestionably it's absorbed.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Excuse me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Well, I think you have made that point clear.

Now, if you will proceed—you were speaking of the Duclos letter.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, now, if anybody wanted any manifestation of the bankruptcy, Communist Party thinking, especially in terms of the United States and its real dependence on what they got directly or what they read in the press—I have no direct way of knowing, but you had the Duclos letter. If you remember, we had a policy in the United States based on the thesis that capitalism and communism could coexist. It led to the formation of what was known as the Communist Political Association which was no longer to be a closed thing.

Now, suddenly a letter appeared in France by Duclos. The very people that we had been led to believe for years were the paragons of wisdom, the people in whom all Marxism reposed and could answer all the questions now had been wrong for their whole existence in the party.

Take, for instance, the example of Earl Browder, who 1 week previous to that—my God, I mean, the veneration of this man was tremendous.

Mr. DOYLE. That was in April of 1945?

Mr. ROSSEN. Somewhere in there. I don't remember the exact date.

Suddenly, all of his work, everything, was completely destroyed.

Now, it certainly could not have been based on the thinking of the American Communist Party as such. I mean one would have to be a fool to think so.

So that actually the—it was another example of not only the—it was another example of the cynicism, the deep cynicism, of the Communist Party as I knew it; and with that Duclos letter—I mean, it's hard to say these are all cumulative steps, I suppose, but with the Duclos letter I pretty much made up my mind. In other words, I was ready at that point to start away, to move away, from the party, definitely.

I had tried to do it by moving away from Hollywood in 1944. I had done nothing for a year. I was very disturbed by a great many things that were going on in the party, and my own work. I moved away from Hollywood and came here.

MR. TAVENNER. Were those things that went on in the party of a dictatorial nature?

MR. ROSSEN. Not in relation to myself at the time, I don't think so. Nobody ever tried to tell me what to write, or what to do. Whatever the reason is another story, but nobody ever came to me and said, "This is what you write," or "This is what you do."

I think it was much more in relation to my party work, and a—in an attempt almost—the point I made before—attempt to almost make me into a functionary, in a sense, you know—

MR. TAVENNER. Yes.

MR. ROSSEN. Caused me to leave Hollywood, and I stayed here in New York for a year.

I came back, I think, right after the Duclos letter—oh, within a month or so—and I began to start to move—I think I stopped paying dues somewhere around 1946, because I—not only do I remember it, but I remember the testimony of Collins,¹ who claimed there was a big discussion as to whether or not they ought to throw me out or collect the dues, or whatever it was; and I honestly think that by 1947 I was out of the party.

Now, I cannot really pinpoint dates to that extent, Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER. Yes.

MR. ROSSEN. It is a very difficult thing to do.

I believe if I hadn't been subpoenaed in 1947 I would have gone even further away from the party. The subpoena brought me back in the end of 1947 to an activity specifically related to that committee and to the fight of the Hollywood Ten which, you may know, was originally the Hollywood Nineteen. I was one of the 19 who were subpoenaed in 1947.

Whatever meetings I might have attended after that I'm pretty sure were in direct relation to this specific problem, but I know by the end of 1947, somewhere in, around there, I was out—and I was out very, very completely.

And this doesn't mean, you know, I still don't contribute money to certain things I believe in.

For instance, I contributed, I think, to the Wallace campaign. Well, I thought it was a pretty good idea to have a third party in this country, and one doesn't go—at least, I don't, or I can't—I can't change—to go from being a member of the extreme left to being a member of the extreme right.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, now, this committee is in no way interested in the question—

MR. ROSSEN. I'm sorry.

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). Of—

MR. ROSSEN. I was just expressing an opinion—

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). Of political opinions and beliefs.

MR. ROSSEN (continuing). And I'm sorry I brought that up.

But it seems to me, in trying to think through it—you know, what I can offer—it seems to me that—I still feel that many of the reasons that I had were right. I feel very strongly that the Communist Party can never be the instrument to get or effect those reasons, or make them work.

I don't think that the slogan "Communism Is Twentieth Century Democracy" was true at that time, when it was first projected, and

¹ Richard Collins.

it's certainly by this time—should be—pretty thoroughly discredited. I don't see how anyone can still believe it, but I believed very firmly in a promise of democracy.

What this country really can become is still something to be believed in very firmly, very strongly, with great conviction, and those who are opposed to that democracy must be—well, I'm trying to fish for words—they're pretty hard on this subject—well, in other words, what I am trying to say is that I think we ought to have a feeling today—I wouldn't like to see young people today believe what I believed in. I wouldn't like to have them feel there is no growth left in this country; there are no horizons: we have reached our apex, and that it's a dead society. It's not a dead society. It's a young society; it's a growing society; it's a healthy society. It needs a lot of corrections, of course, and all societies do; but it needs the corrections and can get the corrections and realize its hope only in terms of the system of government that's been devised.

That's my feeling.

MR. TAVENNER. To express it another way, you would feel at this time that your views, whether liberal or not, could be accomplished and worked for by you outside of the Communist Party?

MR. ROSSEN. Very definitely.

MR. CLARDY. But not inside?

MR. ROSSEN. No; I don't believe the Communist Party has any part—any role—to play.

MR. CLARDY. Except destructive?

MR. ROSSEN. And I am looking for constructive.

MR. TAVENNER. An interesting thing has occurred in your case. You appeared before this committee and resorted to the use of the fifth amendment as a reason for not giving the committee the information at that time which you possessed. Do you have any feeling now that having done so you are subjecting yourself to criminal prosecution?

MR. ROSSEN. Now?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes.

MR. ROSSEN. At this time?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes.

MR. ROSSEN. No; I haven't got that feeling at all.

MR. CLARDY. Mr. Counsel, can it be put a little more directly than that?

As a matter of fact, you raised the fifth amendment, which obviously was intended to convey to you the impression that you thought that if you didn't raise it you might be incriminating yourself. Now, you have come forth and made a clear statement of the things you could have testified to at that time—

MR. ROSSEN. Correct.

MR. CLARDY (continuing). And the committee at least sees—and I am sure you must see—that there is nothing in your story that could tlen or now in any way possibly incriminate you.

Do you not agree that is a fact?

MR. ROSSEN. No; I don't think so. I don't think you can be incriminated if you tell the truth.

MR. CLARDY. That is what I had in mind, and had you at that time—

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I have to talk——

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Been as far away from that persuasion that got you over into left field as you are now, and if you had not raised the fifth amendment, you would not have been in jeopardy at all, would you?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; not in terms of my own personal self.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. I can only say that in terms of my own self personally.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I am talking about.

So, those who raise the screen of the fifth amendment are really erecting a bogeyman that has nothing behind it whatsoever——

Mr. ROSSEN. I think so.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). So far as you can see it; is that true?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. VELDE. I would like to say for the record at this point in my knowledge of the committee's activities there has never been any witness brought before the committee who has ever been incriminated in any way if he answered the questions put to him and answered them truthfully.

Mr. CLARDY. There's never been a prosecution of such a witness at any time.

Mr. VELDE. Even resulting from the committee hearings.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I mean.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not asked you the many questions I asked you when you appeared before regarding your participation in Communist-front activities and, because of the lateness of the hour, I am not going to do it now, except in this very general way: You have spoken of the great effort that was made in increasing the prestige of writers so that they would be in a position to do the bidding of the party. Did participation in Communist-front or mass organizations constitute a part of the bidding of the party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Oh, yes; unquestionably. The use of names on various boards—the degree of their prestige was the degree to which you could attract more people to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Now, just state briefly to the committee, if you will, what the importance of the Communist-front organization is in the Communist scheme of things.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, the basic importance—I'll try to state it as briefly as I can—that it projects the Communist Party—whatever the possible line at that time—that organization is a means and a conveyance of projecting it outside of the Communist Party membership itself. It attracts large people, and to the degree that the people who serve on these organizations are people of prestige—to that degree does it attract people who believe in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that the ultimate purpose of the Communist Party organization is to increase its power——

Mr. ROSSEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). By recruiting and by extension of the Communist Party principles?

Mr. ROSSEN. By influencing it. By influencing.

Mr. MOULDER. As an example of that, doesn't Paul Robeson serve as an example of the point you tried to make? Do you think he has been exploited in that manner——

Mr. ROSSEN. Well——

Mr. MOULDER (continuing). To attract the colored people?

Mr. ROSSEN. I can't speak for Robeson, but naturally Robeson's prestige was a very great prestige, or was at a certain time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you have given us the names of persons who were involved in particular functions, which are of importance to the committee. I would like now to ask you about a number of other people.

Were you acquainted with Henry Meyers—M-e-y-e-r-s?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in each of these instances, I want you to identify a person as a member of the Communist Party only if you possess personal knowledge.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; that's—I'm using that.

Mr. MOULDER. Could you locate where his residence is?

Mr. ROSSEN. I happen to know that he——

Mr. TAVENNER. And give a further identifying information where you can.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I have known Henry Meyers for a long time. I have been in branches with him.

Mr. CLARDY. Been in what?

Mr. ROSSEN. Branches of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a writer or an actor?

Mr. ROSSEN. He was a writer—writer and lyricist.

Mr. MOULDER. And resided where?

Mr. ROSSEN. California. I don't know his address.

Mr. TAVENNER. Maurice Clark?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; he was a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Harold Manoff—M-a-n-o-f-f?

Mr. ROSSEN. Harold Manoff?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. I wouldn't know anything about him.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know?

Mr. MOULDER. Do we have a record of those people he is identifying so he won't be confused with other people of similar names?

Mr. TAVENNER. We have the information——

Mr. MOULDER. I mean, can he——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). In many instances. I am not certain it is definite in all instances.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, these are all persons living in California, or in the California area?

Mr. TAVENNER. At least were.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I mean.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't know about now.

Mr. CLARDY. They were living there at that time when he could have known them: is that right?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Alvah Bessie?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I knew him to be a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a writer?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hugo Butler?

Mr. ROSSEN. He was a writer. He was a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Glenda Sullivan?

Mr. ROSSEN. She was a member. I don't know what her occupation was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hal Smith?

Mr. ROSSEN. I can't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paul Jarrico.

Mr. ROSSEN. He was a member; a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with John Bright—

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. B-r-i-g-h-t?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; he was a member; writer; subsequently left the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lester Fuller?

Mr. ROSSEN. He was a member—long time ago. I knew him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a writer?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Morton—

Mr. ROSSEN. No—wait a minute—I think he was a director, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. TAVENNER. Morton Grant?

Mr. ROSSEN. Writer; member of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lilith James—L-i-l-i-t-h.

Mr. ROSSEN. She is a member of the party; wife of Dan James. I think she is a writer, too; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have already identified Dan James—

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). In connection with one of the organizations.

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Charles Leonard?

Mr. ROSSEN. I can't recall. No; I just couldn't make a direct identification.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isobel Lennart?

Mr. ROSSEN. She was a member; a writer.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, so there will be no question about it, you are reading only names of persons who have been identified at sometime in the past—

Mr. TAVENNER. That is understood.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And seeking further identification from this witness; is that right?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

William Pomerance?

Mr. ROSSEN. He was a member. He was—he wasn't a writer. His—he was an executive secretary of the Screen Writers' Guild at one time, and I think at one time also had the same kind of job at the Screen Cartoonists' Guild.

Mr. MOULDER. You were acquainted with all those people that Mr. Tavenner named in the State of California?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; yes. It would only be during the time I was there, and during the time I was—I'll make that very clear—this will only relate to the time I was a member of the Communist Party. I know nothing of their activities, of their present connections, subsequent to 1947.

Mr. MOULDER. You are referring to that period of time——

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. MOULDER (continuing). When you were in the State of California?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know anything regarding the circumstances of the employment of Pomerance¹ by the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. ROSSEN. No; I know nothing at all about that. I could only talk in terms of his employment at the Screen Writers' Guild. I don't think I knew Pomerance at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been placed to any inconvenience or any special criticism as a result of your testimony before this committee in June of 1951, at which time you expressed in very definite terms your opposition, your then opposition, to the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; but there's been a great deal of criticism of my position in 1951 both directly and indirectly, despite the fact that I did not give this committee any names or any information. The fact that I expressed my opposition to communism at that time was enough to expose me to many different kinds of criticism in my several years since I have appeared before this committee.

There's a very interesting commentary that just—purely on the issue, I would say, civil rights—the Communist Party was not very willing to espouse that cause purely in terms of disagreeing with them on a political level. In other words, civil rights did not work at all in terms of Communist policy if you disagreed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. It only worked if you agreed.

And I've been subject to certain criticism, but that—I want to make this clear—that has not influenced my decision to come here today. If I had been influenced by that, it would be purely of a matter, you know, sort of a kind of revenge motive—I should have come back here 30 days after I left, but I didn't. I just want to get that point very clear.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Prior to your coming to this committee, did you go to any Government agency?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you told the Government agency——

Mr. ROSSEN. I told the Government agency——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). All the facts within——

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). Of facts I had——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Your knowledge?

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). In my knowledge; that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I am glad you made your decision to come back.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

¹ Abraham Pomerance.

Mr. CLARDY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Just this, Mr. Chairman: I have been impressed, of course, by the testimony of many witnesses that I have heard in the last few months—I am a freshman member of this committee—but I don't believe any testimony has impressed me as much as that of the witness here this afternoon.

Now, you said at the opening of your statement, with much sincerity, that it was the mental conflicts as a young man in the late twenties and the frustrations and the cynicism of that time that led you into the party.

I am just wondering today, after all of the experience that you have had, whether or not you don't feel that one or more of the great religious movements that exist in this country today would solve for a young man, young person, at this time the conflicts that you had at that time.

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, that is a very difficult question for me to answer because I think I—I couldn't answer that in terms of other people, and their own feeling about religion, you know—

Mr. SCHERER. Well—

Mr. ROSSEN. And it seems to me I would be going into a realm, honestly, which I have no right to go into, and I—you know, I would like to answer the question, if I could, but I just can't. I honestly can't.

Mr. SCHERER. I appreciate your frank reply.

Mr. ROSSEN. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. I have no questions, but I do want to commend Mr. Rossen for coming before the committee. I know it has required courage on your part, and I, as a member of the committee, am certainly grateful you have appeared before the committee and have so testified as you have; and by your testimony and cooperation in the work of this committee, you are proving your character, sincerity, and loyalty as an American citizen.

Mr. ROSSEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to ask this witness the same question I ask almost always of witnesses who come to try to help us, and that, Mr. Rossen, is this question, based on Public Law 601, passed in 1945 by the United States Congress, which is to this effect: Whether or not you have any recommendation or suggestion to make to this committee in the field or area of remedial legislation?

We are challenged under one section of Public Law 601 to give Congress a factual report on our investigations and then to also report to Congress on "all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation."

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Have you had time to think on this area of the work of this committee and of your Congress and of subversive activities to the point where you are able to give us any suggestions at this time?

Mr. ROSSEN. I have thought about it, but I honestly don't have any suggestions for legislation that I could give you, because I just can't crystallize it in my own mind.

I am sure many of you are also confused by this issue, and I am not a lawmaker.

I do feel very strongly—I know the only thing I feel, no matter what it is, it has to be done in terms of making this democracy work effectively. This is your job. This is the job of making this country the kind of country in terms of all kinds of opportunities and non-discrimination, et cetera, that can leave no field for communism to flourish.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, apparently the framers of Public Law 601 had in mind that Congress, after investigations by this committee, should think in terms of some advancement or some progress, because they expressly set that out in this section of the law—that we should recommend to Congress as to any necessary remedial legislation.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this distinguished witness coming back to us, voluntarily, after claiming the constitutional protection on June 25, 1951, is a good illustration of the fact I believe we ought to even more vigorously than ever emphasize the fact that this committee does stand very cordially ready and willing to make its staff and its committee members even available to American citizens who want to come voluntarily and help us in the interests of our national security and safety.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle, the Chair concurs with your statement.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I know the Chair concurs, and I know that every member of this committee concurs; but somehow I have come to feel that perhaps we haven't yet done it enough, Mr. Chairman. I am convinced of that fact, and you will probably find me emphasizing that every time you ask me, under proper circumstances, if I have a question.

I do want to emphasize, Mr. Rossen, that I, as a member of the committee, appreciate your coming.

There was one point at which you used certain language. I know it will only take a minute, but I wish you would help clear up for me as to what you meant. I tried to hurriedly write it down, and this is purported to be substantially your quote:

I don't longer think that any citizen has the individual right to claim on his own ground of individual morality and put that ground up against the security and safety of our Nation.

Do you remember saying something substantially thus?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes; I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I am glad I caught the substance of it, then, in a hurry. What did you mean by that?

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, truthfully, the reason I claimed the fifth amendment in 1951 was because I didn't want to give any names, and that is what I conceived to be a moral position to it.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, in June of 1951 you claimed it as an individual moral position——

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). You were taking when you claimed the constitutional provision——

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Under the fifth amendment?

Mr. ROSSEN. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then what compelled you to abandon that individual—

Mr. ROSSEN. Well, I—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Moral position?

Mr. ROSSEN. I think that is contained in what I said. I think, as I kept thinking through my own position and as I kept seeing the tensions in the world increase, and our own country in the midst of crisis after crisis—I felt that I, as an individual, did not have the right to withhold my own—whatever information I had from any regularly constituted agency of the Government.

Mr. DOYLE. Or may I put it this way, in conclusion—if I am putting it too strong now—

Mr. ROSSEN. No; that is all right.

Mr. DOYLE. Or if I am putting it stronger than you would put it, you tell me—in other words, you came to the conclusion, based upon your intimate personal knowledge, gained over a term of years in the Communist Party, that you no longer could claim your individual moral grounds and legal grounds of the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution when claiming that ground prevented you from giving to your own Nation the protection and security which you came to feel it was entitled to as a result of your personal knowledge?

Mr. ROSSEN. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you put yourself, then, in a position, as a result of your patriotism or patriotic attitude toward your Nation, which you came to subsequent to January 25, 1951, where you were willing to be labeled a stool pigeon and an informer, but you felt that was perhaps the privilege rather than a disgrace?

Mr. ROSSEN. I don't feel that I'm being a stool pigeon or an informer. I refuse—I just won't accept that characterization.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Doyle means—

Mr. ROSSEN. No; no. I am not—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). You will be—

Mr. ROSSEN (continuing). Disagreeing with Mr. Doyle, but I think that is a rather romantic—that is like children playing at cops and robbers. They are just kidding themselves, and I don't care what the characterizations in terms of—people can take whatever position they want. I know what I feel like within myself. Characterization or no characterization, I don't feel that way.

Mr. DOYLE. May I make this one observation—I made it in the case of Artie Shaw, a musician, and a couple of others of you men who have reached your pinnacle in your own art and profession: I hope I may live to see the time when you, as a distinguished American director and producer, will find it not only a personal satisfaction but commercially profitable to put into the pictures or on the legitimate stage something of vigor and vitality for the American people to go and see, which will be an inspiration to them and will give to American people the dynamics, be a cause of giving to us the dynamics, of making our democracy work, to that point where our American youth will have no reason to look elsewhere than right within the framework of our American Government for the answer.

Mr. ROSSEN. I shall certainly try.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to join with the other members of the committee in expressing my appreciation for the vast amount of information that this witness has given us in his testimony.

No questions.

Mr. ROSSEN. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. And in the interest of saving time, Mr. Rossen, let me say I join with my colleagues in expressing appreciation to you for the vast fund of information you have given to us.

Now, the Chair would like to make a statement.

You are dismissed, with the committee's thanks, Mr. Rossen.

I want to explain to the general public that the committee has come to New York for the purposes of fulfilling its obligations which were imposed upon it by the House of Representatives—that being to investigate subversive propaganda and activities, ascertain facts relative to subversive influences operating in this country and to report to Congress for the purposes of remedial legislation.

The committee came to New York also in the interests of economy. We felt that it was more economical for the committee and its staff to come to New York than it would be to have the number of witnesses which we heard subpoenaed to Washington, D. C. That was one of the motivating reasons for our coming to New York City.

During the course of these hearings we have heard 19 witnesses, 7 of whom were cooperative and who gave a great deal of information which will help us immensely in performing the functions imposed upon us by Congress.

I would like to especially thank Mr. Robert Rossen, our last witness, Mrs. Dorothy Funn, and Mr. Robert Gladnick for the tremendous amount of information that they very willingly and truthfully gave to the committee.

I would like to take this opportunity, too, to thank Mr. Morgan, the superintendent of this building, and Mr. Carnell, clerk of the court, and their staffs.

The Office of the Attorney General of the United States has been most helpful and the United States Marshal's office and the New York City police and others have been most efficient in maintaining proper decorum throughout these most important hearings.

The good people of the city of New York—and most patriotic people, I might add—have been most generous and courteous to the committee, the members of its staff, throughout these hearings.

These hearings are being concluded today because Members of the Congress on the committee have other duties to fulfill besides chasing Reds, so to speak, and I am sure that the Members here know that their offices are probably filled with letters, unanswered letters, at the present time, and, so, the committee members must get back to attend to other business which is in the interests of the people of the United States.

I would like to reiterate the statement that has often been made by previous chairmen of this committee and by myself: That any person who was mentioned in the course of these hearings is invited to come to our counsel or any member of the committee if he feels that he has been smeared or in any other way his reputation has been damaged.

We are anxious that people also who have information relative to subversive activities come before our committee and give us the benefit of their knowledge so that we might more effectively do the work that was imposed upon us by Congress and by the American people.

I should also like to thank not only the press, but the radio, television, and newsreel for the most efficient and very courteous treatment that they have given members of the committee and for their faithful reporting of the hearing as it progressed.

With that, the committee is adjourned until further call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 5:50 p. m., the hearing was adjourned, subject to call of the chairman.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS	Page
Backus, Georgia	1480
Barzman, Ben	1480
Berkeley, Martin	1428, 1429
Biberman, Edward	1448, 1449
Bigelman, Leo	1461
Blankfort, Henry, Jr	1480
Blowitz, Bill	1474, 1475
Bright, John	1494
Browder, Earl	1481, 1482, 1485, 1489
Buchman, Sidney	1471, 1475, 1481
Butler, Hugo	1494
Cacchione, Peter V	1432
Clark, Maurice	1493
Cole, Lester	1471
Collins, Richard	1473, 1475, 1477, 1490
Dmytryk, Edward	1479
Endore, Guy	1480
Ernst, Morris	1442
Ettinger, Eve	1428
Fairchild, Henry Pratt	1434, 1437
Faragoh, Francis	1478, 1479
Finn, Pauline Lauber	1474
Fleury, Bernyce	1449
Foster, William Z	1432
Frankel, Osmund K	1428-1442
Fuller, Lester	1494
Funn, Dorothy K	1431, 1499
Gannes, Harry	1467
Gerson, Simon W	1432
Gladnick, Robert	1499
Grant, Morton	1494
Harris, Lou	1462, 1480
Hunter, Ian	1480
Ivens, Joris	1478, 1479
James, Dan	1480, 1494
James, Lilith	1494
Jarrico, Paul	1494
Kraft, Hy	1481
Lardner, Ring, Jr	1471, 1477
Lawson, John Howard	1462, 1471, 1474, 1475, 1481
Lennart, Isobel	1494
Leonard, Charles	1494
Levy, Melvin	1475, 1477
Maltz, Albert	1487, 1488
Manoff, Harold	1493
Meyers, Henry	1493
Michoels	1468, 1469
Mischel, Joseph	1475, 1478
Moore, Sam	1475
Nolan, Edward	1418
Pfeffer, Itzy	1468, 1469
Polifka, Bernyce	1449
Pomerance, Abraham	1495
Purcell, Gertrude	1471
Randolph, Phillip	1432

Rapf, Maurice	1471
Reis, Meta	1475
Rinaldo, Fred	1481
Robinson, Earl	1478, 1479
Robinson, Sugar Ray	1432
Roberts, Marguerite	1472
Roberts, Stanley	1478
Robeson, Paul	1492, 1493
Rossen, Robert	1454-1499 (testimony)
Roth, Ann	1471
Ruthven, Madelaine	1462
Sabinson, Lee	1427, 1428-1442 (testimony)
Sanchez, Emily	1437
Salt, Waldo	1480
Schulberg, Budd Wilson	1471
Schwartz, Zachary	1442-1453 (testimony)
Scott, Adrian	1481
Shapiro, Vic	1475
Shaw, Artie	1434
Silver, Max	1464, 1481, 1482
Simon	1469
Slonsky	1469
Smith, Hal	1494
Solomon, Louis	1475, 1477
Sullivan, Glenda	1494
Townsend, Leo	1480
Trivers, Paul	1480
Trumbo, Dalton	1471
Tuttle, Frank	1480
Uris, Michael	1461
Vorhaus, Bernard	1477
Wexley, John	1477

ORGANIZATIONS

American Continental Congress for Peace	1434, 1437
American Jewish League Against Communism	1451
Civil Rights Congress	1433
College of the City of New York	1428
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy	1436, 1437
Congress of Industrial Organizations	1432
Hollywood Writers' Mobilization	1449, 1450, 1472-1477, 1486
Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions	1429
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee	1463
National Citizens Political Action Committee of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions	1429
National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions	1434-1437
National Negro Congress	1431, 1432
New York University	1457
Progressive Citizens of America	1429
Screen Cartoonists' Guild	1494
Screen Playwrights	1460
Screen Writers Guild	1460, 1470, 1472, 1474, 1476, 1487, 1494, 1495
United Negro and Allied Veterans of America	1432
Writers Congress	1475-1477, 1479
Writers' War Board	1472

PUBLICATIONS

Daily Worker	1431-1433, 1437, 1465-1467
Hollywood Quarterly	1450
Jewish Morning Freiheit	1467
New Masses	1463, 1465
Peoples' World	1463, 1465
Washington Post	1431, 1437, 1440
Worker	1466

W. P. PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05018 336 5

